

# *Concordia* *Theological Monthly*

---

---

Vol. XIII

FEBRUARY, 1942

No. 2

---

## Through Justification unto Sanctification

(Essay read at the convention of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States held at Fort Wayne, Ind., June 1941.)

---

### I

"Will ye also go away?" Jesus said to His disciples, John 6:66. It called for decision. It was for many in Israel the parting of the ways. The people had hailed Him vociferously as the Great Prophet. The enthusiasm had reached its climax when Jesus fed the five thousand. Then Jesus said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." Jesus gave them a clear statement of the nature of His kingdom and of His office, of the purpose of His coming, and of the results. Then came the reaction; many said: "This is a hard saying," left Him, and walked no longer with Him. And Jesus turned to His disciples and asked them: "Will ye also go away?" Jesus evidently expected a negative answer; but He wants that answer. No conscription in Christ's kingdom; none but volunteers. At the same time, His words foretell isolation for them. You note what happened, He means to say; many have gone away; will you join the many or make up your mind to stay with Me and the few?

In many respects the time in which we are living is a period of transition. In politics, in economics, in international relationships, the old things seem to be passing away; a new world seems to be rising. Social institutions that have stood for a millennium seem to be shaking. In religion, too, there has for some time been evident a trend to shelve the old and to inaugurate a new alignment: To counteract the vast falling away from all religion, let religious people forget all differences of the past and present a common front against the foe.

The situation is aggravated by three things. The religious world is again teeming with millennial extravagances. If history ever repeats itself, it is in this, that after every great world cata-

trophe there is a revival of the old Jewish hopes of an earthly world-kingdom of Messiah, of a visible triumphant reign of Christ on earth, a realm in which you no longer have to worry for bread, but the multitude will be fed with five loaves and two fishes.—Then, in view of social and economic conditions in the world, the cry is raised on all sides: What is the Church good for? One third of the people are ill fed, ill kept and ill housed; what are you going to do about it? Quit looking through a telescope at the far-off eternity and consider the condition of your neighbor next door; there lies the Church's problem and opportunity.—And, finally, taking its cue from the growing demand for united action on the part of all religious people, the Papacy is again raising its head. This unity for which everybody is clamoring now—did not the world have it in the days before Luther caused all this division? And was not that the golden age of peace and general satisfaction, with the Church, an efficient mother, caring for all? So why not go back to that time under the leadership of those who have an experience of almost 2,000 years? They count on it that most people know little or no church history, and—they are usually right.

For us the present meeting may be looked upon as an occasion that calls for a decision: the first convention after our centennial. A century lies behind us; what is to be our policy for the second century, now beginning? And before this convention stands the Christ and says: "Many have gone away; will ye also go away?"

The reason why so many had turned away from Christ was this: He had assured them that they must be saved by His work or go forever unsaved. "If ye believe not that I am He" (the Son of God, the Savior of the world), "ye shall die in your sins." The purpose of His coming was to seek and to save that which was lost. The center of His teaching was salvation through His blood.

The purpose of all religion is to give an answer to that question, What must I do to be saved? Every man knows by nature that all is not well between him and his God; and the object he seeks to attain in his religious life is to get right with God. The answer which Christ and the Christian religion give to that question is: "There is no difference; they have all sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus." Justification by grace through faith in Christ, that has always since its foundation been the center of all teaching and confession in the Christian Church. On the other hand, that doctrine has always been the chief point of division. Those disciples left Jesus and walked no longer with Him because He taught that you must take your salvation from Him as a free gift, or go forever without. When in the course of

centuries the Church departed farther and farther from the doctrine once delivered unto the saints, the chief point of departure—chief because it was most important and most fatal, and chief because it led to all other errors—was in the doctrine of justification. When two centuries after the Reformation Rationalism conquered the Christian world so completely that our fathers saw no other way of rescue but to look for another world, the chief point of departure was again the doctrine of justification. So today the really fatal element in the false teaching in all erring churches is their denial of justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. And when the Lord today asks us, "Will ye also go away?" the real focus of the question is this: Are you in this second century going to hold staunchly to the old Christian, Lutheran, Missourian, doctrine of justification, or do you think you have found something better?

The man who, under God's guidance and by divine inspiration, has given us the plainest and most extensive instruction on this all-important doctrine is St. Paul. He could speak plainly to others because he spoke by experience. To the Philippians he wrote (chap. 3:4-9): "If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: circumcized the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the Law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the Church; touching the righteousness which is in the Law, blameless. But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them all but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the Law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." Paul means to say, I've tried everything else. He was "brought up at the feet of Gamaliel and taught according to the perfect manner of the Law of the fathers and was zealous toward God," Acts 22:3. He knew the Law and tried to live up to it; and he was so successful that others regarded him as an example of zeal, so successful in his own eyes that he trusted in himself that he was righteous and despised others, that he thanked God that he was not as other men were, that he hated and persecuted those who taught another way of salvation than that by the Law. And then that Christ whom he persecuted opened his eyes; and now the righteous Pharisee saw that he had never known what true righteousness is, the righteousness that avails before God, because he had not known what the Law really demands and what sin is. The scales fell from his eyes, and he saw that sin was

inherent in him, so much a part of him that he could not escape it. And this law of sin in his members worked all kinds of actual sin, which he committed even against his will. And the result of all of this was death, inescapable; "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Rom. 7:24.

But he continues: "I thank God through Jesus Christ, our Lord." There is another way of salvation, a way open to all sinners. And that he now preached, in season and out of season, to all who would listen, to Jews and to Greeks. This way is not the way of works, of keeping the Law of God; "for as many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all the things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them," Gal. 3:10. It is ignorance to try that, Rom. 10:2, 3; more than that, foolishness, Gal. 3:1-3. That is the religion of the flesh, of natural man, Phil. 3:4, but disobedience to God, Rom. 10:3. No, "by the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight"; by the Law is only knowledge of sin, Rom. 3:20. This is the way of salvation, that God justifies the ungodly; the man who worketh not, Rom. 4:5; the man who has no righteousness of his own, which is of the Law, Phil. 3:9. How can the just God do that? So: He sent His Son to do for us what we should have done, putting Him under the Law to redeem them that were under the Law, Gal. 4:4, 5; by laying all our sins on Jesus, making "Him to be sin for us who knew no sin," 2 Cor. 5:21, so thoroughly accounting our sins to Him that He suffered the consequences, the punishment of our sins; He has redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us," Gal. 3:13. For the sake of this work of His Son, God now no longer imputes our trespasses to us, 2 Cor. 5:19; Rom. 4:8, but forgives them and covers them, Rom. 4:7; in the place of our sin He now imputes righteousness, Rom. 4:6. Thus we are now reconciled to God by the death of His Son, Rom. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:18, 19.

Paul pictures it all as a judicial act in the court of God. The Judge is God, Rom. 8:33: "It is God that justifieth." The criminal is man, all men, Rom. 3:23: "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." The accuser is the Law, Gal. 3:10. There is a witness that testifies to our guilt, our conscience, Rom. 2:15; but also an Advocate who pleads for the sinner and intercedes for him, Rom. 8:34. And the sentence is that the criminals standing in that court, all of them and every single one of them, are justified. Rom. 5:18, 19: "By the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous." The world, all men and every

one of them, is reconciled with God, 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."

This fact that all the world is reconciled with God because Christ has earned for all of them the righteousness that avails before God, this fact is now revealed in the Gospel, Rom. 1:17; 3:21, 22. And in the preaching of the Gospel, God now offers this righteousness to each and every one of us and pleads with us: "Be ye reconciled to God," 2 Cor. 5:20. He who believes this accepts for his own person the righteousness of Christ; God imputes the righteousness of Christ to him, Phil. 3:9; Rom. 4:6, 24. So it is that we are justified by faith, Rom. 3:26, 28; 4:5; 5:1; Gal. 2:16, and many other passages.

So this man, who had been most zealous in the most rigid form of work-righteousness, had by the grace of God come to the conviction that in the matter of his salvation he must discard his own works entirely and must be justified freely, by the grace of God, for the sake of the merits of Jesus Christ, given to him through faith. And he whom even his proudest works had never brought anything but despair, he now found in his trust in the Savior a deep, sincere peace of heart, and an assurance of his salvation which moved him to triumphant rejoicing: "If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life," Rom. 5:10. But "if God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation or distress or persecution or famine or nakedness or peril or sword? . . . I am persuaded that neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor powers nor things present nor things to come nor height nor depth nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord," Rom. 8:31-39.

There is a striking similarity between the experience of Paul and that of the Augustinian monk who, 1500 years later, sat in his cell in the monastery in Erfurt worrying over that book bound in red leather which the monks had put into his hands when he entered their cloister. Again the Church, the bearer of God's revelation to the sinner, had allowed the revealed way of salvation to be obstructed, well-nigh buried under a load of Pharisaic teaching. The Church taught that the sinner must work out his own justification

before God. It is true, they still used the same terms by which St. Paul and other men of God describe justification. They still said, Man is justified by grace; but the grace of God was, so they taught, that gift of God by which He enlightened the understanding and so changed the will of man that he now was able to do the will of God and work out his own salvation. They still said, Man must be saved through the merits of Christ; but what they taught was this: Christ has earned for us that grace of God which now enables us to earn our own salvation by our works. They still said, Man must be saved by faith; but faith to them meant merely the knowledge that men must be saved by the deeds of love, which by virtue of the infused grace of God man himself can do. That was the teaching of the Church: You must do the best you can towards fulfilling the will of God; if you do that, then God will for Christ's sake grant you His grace to help you earn your salvation.

That teaching of the Church drove Luther into the monastery. Not a misunderstanding of Catholic teaching, as some would have you believe; that was what they taught: God is righteous, and the sinner, to appease Him, must make satisfaction with his good works; true, God gives grace for these works, but faith and grace presuppose that the sinner does sufficient good works to make God gracious to him. To Luther, as indeed to every sincere Christian, the supreme concern of life was the soul's salvation; and ever since he learned to understand the teaching of the Church, the question that troubled him was: "*Wie kriege ich einen gnaedigen Gott?*" What can I do to merit the grace and favor of God? He tried the traditional Catholic way of works, and the longer and the more conscientiously he tried it, the more was he convinced that he failed. With many others he entered the monastery; there, away from the wicked world with its temptations, in the altogether spiritual life of the monk, there he hoped to be able to lead the life that would move God to be gracious to him; there he would find the solution to his troubles.

He did not find it. He almost found death; he fasted and scourged himself; he practised all the ordinary forms of maceration and invented new ones; all to no purpose. "For when an awakened soul starts to find rest in work-righteousness, it stands on a foundation of loose sand, which it feels running and traveling beneath it, and it must go from one good work to another and to another and so on without end." He was told that he must find relief in penance. So he wearied his superiors by his continual use of this sacrament. The slightest breach of the most trifling conventional regulation he looked upon as a sin and ran to confess it at once and receive absolution, until the perplexed lad was ordered to cease confession until he had committed a sin worth

confessing. He gained the reputation of being a miracle of piety; for himself he lived a life of mental anguish, whispering to himself that he was ripe for the gallows.

They tell us that Luther was abnormal, that he committed the error of trying works too exclusively; he should have followed that "amazingly delicate adjustment between faith and good works" at which the medieval Church had arrived and in which some of the more serious minds found comfort: In hours of doubt and affliction you must forget your own deficiencies and rest on the comforting promises of the Gospel, when these hours are over, you must again figure with your own works and merits.—Well, Luther may have been abnormal as a Catholic, but he was a normal thinker. The truth is, he had come to a thorough knowledge of his own sinfulness and his total inability to do anything good, which seems to be lacking in most Catholics; and so he concluded: If my works are to suffice in good days, they should also suffice in evil; and if they fail to give comfort in evil days, they are not yet sufficiently good to avail in good days. Over and above all he wanted certainty; he felt crushed by an agony of doubt touching his future fate.

Temporary help was offered by his associates, chiefly by Staupitz. He told him: It is a mistaken principle that you must attain the love of God by penitential works; you must love God, and then true penitence will follow. But that failed when Luther came with his "grosse Knoten," the sins against the first table of the Law. The fact was he did not love God; he was often tempted to hate God; he did not try to do good because he wanted to, gladly, but because he feared hell-fire. And he could not change his heart.—Staupitz said: "Has not God commanded us to hope? Do we not confess: I believe in the forgiveness of sins?" That helped for a while; then he thought: But you must earn that forgiveness by your works! and he was back again where he started; had he any right to apply God's gracious promises to himself?

And then the last step: Since he could not change his heart to make it love what God loved, since all the sacraments gave him no help to make him holy, was not that a sure sign that God had rejected him and so made the sacraments ineffective?—And he felt like a dead man.

And then God Himself helped him. He led him to see the true meaning of Rom. 1:17: "In the Gospel is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written: The just shall live by faith." To us the passage is so plain that every child in school understands it; the apostle speaks of the righteousness of Christ that is imputed to us by faith, a righteousness which avails

before God. We know that; we have been taught — by Luther. He had been taught otherwise. He was taught that this righteousness was the active righteousness of God, by which He Himself is perfectly just and demands perfect righteousness of the sinner and punishes him if he does not come up to His demands. As long as he had this retributive conception of God's righteousness, the thought had to torture his conscience; how could he love a God who will punish sinners in spite of all they can do? He chafed at that phrase, so oft repeated, "the righteousness of God." And the thought that not only in the Law but even in the Gospel the punitive righteousness of God was manifested, threw him into bitter indignation; he thought that was adding insult to injury: "Then I raged and my conscience was agitated by furious storms. I beat importunately at the passage in Paul, thirsting with a most ardent desire to know what the apostle meant." So he said in 1545.

The light came when he saw the connection between the two clauses of that verse: "the righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel" and "the just shall live by faith." The second clause it evidently an explanation of the first; but if that is so, then St. Paul is not speaking of the punitive righteousness of God at all, but of that righteousness which He mercifully gives or imputes to the sinner and which the sinner receives in faith and is thereby justified in God's sight. "Therefore," he says, "just as I had previously hated the phrase 'righteousness of God,' so now I extolled it with equal love as the sweetest of words, and so to me that passage in Paul was the true gate of Paradise." In the light of this new understanding he now examined all those passages, and one precious Gospel promise after the other was opened to him. Oh, it makes all the difference in the world whether you read these passages with Sinai in the background or Calvary! Is it surprising that this now became the dominant theme of his lecturing and his preaching: For Christ's sake, who has borne our sin and suffered our punishment, God has declared the sinner just and righteous; and this righteousness of Christ is now imputed to the sinner by faith.

Like a golden thread it runs through all his writings. In his introduction to Dr. Brenz's commentary on the prophet Amos (XIV, 168) he commends the author because he stresses above all this doctrine of the righteousness of faith; for it is the head and corner-stone, it alone establishes, feeds, builds, preserves, and defends the Church of God, and without it the Church of God cannot exist for one hour. For no one can teach correctly in the Church nor successfully withstand an opponent who does not hold to this article, or, as St. Paul names it (Titus 2:1), this sound doctrine. — He expresses his surprise that Jerome and Origen have

passed for great teachers in the Church though you can scarcely find three lines in their books which speak of the righteousness of faith; so much are they lost in spiritual interpretations of Bible-stories that with all the two have written no one can become a Christian; and Augustine would not have been any better if the Pelagians had not tormented and driven him to defend this doctrine. But by his experience in that battle he became a true teacher of the Church, almost the only one after the apostles and the early Fathers. Which is a warning for us, he holds; they who do this not are tossed to and fro by the winds of uncertain doctrine, of opinions infinitely multiplied, flung up and down, always learning and never coming to the knowledge of the truth. That has been our own experience, he testifies, until the grace of God has led us into the safe haven and built us on the solid Rock. Again, in his *Commentary on Genesis*, chap. 21:17 (St. Louis edition, I: 1441): "This is the highest article of our faith. If this is taken away, as the Jews do, or corrupted, as the Papists do, then the Church cannot exist, nor God receive His honor, namely, that He is gracious and merciful and would forgive us our sins and save us for His Son's sake." And on Gal. 2:11 (IX: 148): "For what is Peter? What is Paul? What is an angel from heaven? What are all creatures in comparison with the article of justification? Which if we know, then are we in clear light; but if we be ignorant thereof, then are we in most miserable darkness. Wherefore, if you see this article impugned or defaced, fear not to resist either Peter or an angel from heaven, following the example of Paul, who, seeing the majesty of this article to be in danger for the dignity of Peter, had no regard of his dignity and estimation, that he might keep the same pure and uncorrupt." (Middleton's translation.)

Luther points out (*Commentary on John*, chap. 16: 3 — VIII: 627 f.) that all depends on this article; whoever has this has everything. Hence Christians must ever be ready to fight for this article. For even Christ and the apostles stress this article most. They teach other articles, too, e. g., that Mary, a pure virgin, became the mother of Christ; but so little does St. Paul emphasize this that he does not even call her mother, but simply a woman (Gal. 4: 4). But on this he insists to the utmost, that we are saved not by works and Law, but obtain grace and salvation through this Mediator, Christ, alone.— To be sure, this article has been persecuted most by the devil and the world. Others have been attacked, too; none other has caused so much bloodshed and made so many martyrs.— All history teaches that every heresy and error began where this doctrine fell. When Christians grew secure and thought they knew it well, then they began to dispute on other points;

but all of them, however many they were, also failed in this doctrine. For all depends on this; whoever errs in other doctrines will not have this one right either; and even though he holds all others and not this one, it is all vain.—On the other hand, this article has that grace, that, if we hold it in all diligence and faithfulness, we shall not fall into heresy nor run against Christ and His Christianity. For it carries the Holy Spirit, who thereby enlightens the heart.—Where this knowledge of Christ is lost, there the sun has lost his brilliance, and there is nothing but darkness, so that nothing is rightly understood, and there is no defense against error and false doctrine of the devil. And even though the right words of faith and Christ are retained (as was done under the Pope), yet there is no foundation in the heart for any article; there remains nothing but foam.

"We must learn, therefore, diligently the article of justification, as I often admonish you. For all the other articles of our faith are comprehended in it; and if that remain sound, then are all the rest sound" (On Gal. 3:13 — IX:376 — Middleton.) "If we lose this article, we shall not be able to resist any heresy, any false doctrine, no matter how ridiculous and vain it may be, as it happened under the Pope, where we believed things of which we are now ashamed and which we regret." (On Is. 42:21 — VI:521.) "Therefore we do so earnestly set forth, and so often repeat this doctrine of faith or Christian righteousness, that by this means it may be kept in continued exercise and may be plainly discerned from the active righteousness of the Law. Otherwise we shall never be able to hold the true divinity (for by this only doctrine the Church is built, and in this it consisteth)." (Introduction to Galatians, IX:25 — Middleton.)

Luther, who knew by bitter experience how a terrified sinner feels who does not understand this article, but who also by the grace of God had learned to know what a heaven of comfort and peace lies in its true understanding, Luther went to school with the Holy Ghost every day of his life, to learn ever more thoroughly this central doctrine of Holy Writ. In his long exposition of the short 117th Psalm he explains why he so persistently drums on the doctrine that we must be saved without our merit, solely by God's grace given to us in Christ; he knows and daily experiences how the devil in many ways tries to destroy this truth. And if certain saints grow tired of this and think it unnecessary because they think they know it well, yet he knows how much they lack in their pride, because they do not realize how much depends on this doctrine. "For where this is retained pure, Christianity, too, remains pure and united, without sects, for this, and this alone, makes and keeps Christians. With all other doctrines false Chris-

tians and hypocrites may glitter; where this is not retained, it is impossible to keep away error and sects." And in the Introduction to his *Commentary to Galatians* we find this gem: "For in my heart this one article reigneth, even the faith of Christ, from whom, by whom, and unto whom, all my divine studies, day and night, have recourse to and fro continually." (IX:8 — Middleton.)

## II

The doctrine of justification by faith alone has become inextricably linked with the history of our Church. Luther brought back the pure doctrine of justification; that, above all, made him the Reformer of the Church, not only because this doctrine is the essential doctrine for every individual soul but because thereby he undermined the power of the Pope and insured the success and permanency of the Reformation. Every previous attempt at a reformation was blocked and hindered by the Pope's interdict. This is the way it worked. People were taught, and the great mass of them believed, that they must be saved in this way: Through the sacraments — seven of them — God gave grace to a person so that he could work out his own salvation; in no other way could any man be saved. But these sacraments could only be administered by a validly ordained priest, that is, one whose ordination was sanctioned by the Pope; rites administered by any one else were no sacraments and carried no grace. If, therefore, a man was excommunicated, that is, excluded from the use of the sacraments, heaven was closed to him; and when the Pope laid the interdict on a land, that is, commanded his priests no longer to administer the sacraments in that land, then heaven was closed to that land. For hundreds of years before the Reformation every opposition to the Pope and his hierarchy, every attempt at reform, was quashed by the interdict. Usually the bulk of the people backed reform; every one knew it was so greatly needed. They would even brave the interdict — for a while; then the bitter worry of poor ill-informed consciences would drive them back to what they had been taught was the only way of salvation. Luther taught Christian people that your salvation is a personal matter between you and your God; you need no priest as mediator; you yourself have free access to God. If you by faith in the Savior accept the justification earned by Christ for the whole world, then you are justified before God, and no priest, no Pope, no interdict, can keep you out of heaven. And that broke the power of the Pope; people no longer feared his ban.

Our Lutheran Church has therefore always considered this the chief doctrine of Christian faith. Knowledge and acceptance of this doctrine makes a man a Christian; though he knew every-

thing else, but did not believe this, he could not be saved. This doctrine forms the very center of our Confessions. On the nature of justification the Apology says (*Trigl.*, 205:185): "In this passage [Rom. 5:1] to *justify* signifies, according to forensic usage, to acquit a guilty one and declare him righteous, but on account of the righteousness of another, namely, of Christ, which righteousness of another is communicated to us by faith." And the Formula of Concord (793:5): "We believe, teach, and confess that according to the usage of Holy Scripture the word 'justify' means in this article, to absolve, that is, to declare free from sins. Prov. 17:15. Rom. 8:33."

The terms "objective" and "subjective justification," which we use today, are not used in Scripture nor in the Confessions; but the distinction is made in Scripture when St. Paul says, on the one hand, 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them"; Rom. 5:18. "By the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life," and on the other hand, Rom. 3:26: "That He might be just and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," and Rom. 1:17: "The just shall live by faith." And the Formula of Concord says (919): "Concerning the righteousness of faith before God we believe, teach, and confess unanimously, in accordance with the comprehensive summary of our faith and confession presented above, that poor sinful man is justified before God, that is, absolved and declared free and exempt from all his sins and from the sentence of well-deserved condemnation, and adopted into sonship and heirship of eternal life, without any merit or worth of our own, also without any preceding, present, or any subsequent works, out of pure grace, because of the sole merit, complete obedience, bitter suffering, death, and resurrection of our Lord Christ alone, whose obedience is reckoned to us for righteousness. These treasures are offered us by the Holy Ghost in the promise of the holy Gospel; and faith alone is the only means by which we lay hold upon, accept, and apply, and appropriate them to ourselves. . . . For faith justifies not for this cause and reason that it is so good a work and so fair a virtue but because it lays hold of, and accepts, the merits of Christ in the promise of the holy Gospel; for this must be applied and appropriated to us by faith if we are to be justified thereby. Therefore the righteousness which is imputed to faith or to the believer out of pure grace is the obedience, suffering, and resurrection of Christ, since He had made satisfaction for us to the Law and paid for [expiated] our sins." 921: "Accordingly, the word 'justify' here means to declare righteous and free from sins and

to absolve one from eternal punishment for the sake of Christ's righteousness, which is imputed by God to faith, Phil. 3:9."

This is the clear teaching of our Lutheran Church: By the life, suffering, and death of Christ all men are already justified before God. This absolution of all sinners is already past. It is universal, for all sinners, not only for believers. It is perfect, leaving nothing for man to complete it. Without this justification before faith there could be no justification through faith. But this justification the sinner must now accept by faith, and so through faith the sinner is personally justified; not so that man accepts the forgiveness offered in the Word and then God pronounces him just; no, in the moment a man believes in Christ he is just.

Justification, so our Confessions declare (Apol., IV:2 — p. 121), is "the chief topic of Christian doctrine . . . which, understood aright, illumines and amplifies the honor of Christ, which is of especial service for the clear, correct understanding of the entire Holy Scriptures, and alone shows the way to the unspeakable treasure and right knowledge of Christ, and alone opens the door to the entire Bible, and brings necessary and most abundant consolation to devout consciences." And the Formula of Concord (917): "This article concerning justification by faith (as the Apology says) is the chief article in the entire Christian doctrine, without which no poor conscience can have any firm consolation or can truly know the riches of the grace of Christ, as Dr. Luther also has written: 'If this only article remains pure on the battle-field, the Christian Church also remains pure and in goodly harmony and without any sects; but if it does not remain pure, it is not possible that any error or fanatical spirit can be resisted.' And concerning this article especially Paul says that 'a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.'"

Melanchthon becomes really emphatic when in the Apology (339) he writes against that article of the Catholic Confutation of the Augsburg Confession in which "they reject and condemn our statement that men do not merit the remission of sins by good works." He says: "Mark this well! They clearly declare that they reject and condemn this article. What is to be said on a subject so manifest? Here the framers of the Confutation openly show by what spirit they are led. For what in the Church is more certain than that the remission of sins occurs freely for Christ's sake? . . . Here we could cite infinite testimonies from Scripture and from the Fathers that this article is certainly divine and true, and this is the sacred and divine truth. For there is hardly a syllable, hardly a leaf, in the Bible, in the principal books of the Holy Scriptures, where this is not clearly stated." — Most

other doctrines of the Bible are connected with this. This doctrine is the key to the rest of Scripture, and the Bible is a sealed book to every one who does not understand this doctrine, as Luther found in his day. This doctrine is the touchstone of doctrines; whoever teaches this will have others right, too; but wrong in this, wrong in others, too. Again, whoever is wrong in other doctrines will invariably also violate this; every false doctrine touches this center. If this article had been maintained pure, neither the Papacy with the Mass, indulgences, and purgatory, nor Zwingli and Calvin with their false doctrine of the means of grace could have arisen. And whoever today maintains this doctrine pure cannot be deceived by Papists, rationalists, and enthusiasts.

This, therefore, is the article with which the Church stands or falls; as the Apology declares (223): "If there is to be and abide a Christian Church, the pure teaching concerning Christ, concerning the righteousness of faith, must surely be preserved." And Luther in the Smalcald Articles (461): "Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered [nor can anything be granted or permitted contrary to the same] even though heaven and earth, or whatever will not abide, should sink to ruin. 'For there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved,' says Peter, Acts 4:12. 'And with His stripes we are healed,' Is. 53:5. And upon this article all things depend which we teach and practice in opposition to the Pope, the devil, and the whole world. Therefore, we must be sure concerning this doctrine, and not doubt; for otherwise all is lost, and the Pope and devil and all things gain the victory and suit over us."

Catholics were not slow in recognizing that the doctrine of justification by faith alone was not only the chief point of difference between them and the Church of the Reformation, but that it was also the very heart and life of the Reformation. This doctrine therefore became the focus of their attacks. And from the very beginning another doctrine, naturally and inevitably, was drawn into the discussion, the doctrine of sanctification. Dr. Eck already at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530, offered to subscribe to the teaching of Lutherans if they would drop that "by faith alone" and change it to "justification by grace and faith." They, of course, did not accept the offer, for Eck meant grace in the Catholic sense, that is, a good quality in man, the good works done by man with the help of God's grace. When he said, Man is justified by grace and faith, he meant, Man is justified by works and faith. In other words, he wanted sanctification drawn into the deal of a sinner's justification before God. In the Edict of Worms, 1521, pronouncing the ban of the empire on Luther, it was stated that Luther taught

a free, self-pleasing life, excluded from all laws and altogether bestial (XV:2274, 2281). And Eck heads the long list of slanderers of the Lutheran doctrine of justification extending from that time down to the present. Eck said to Luther, "You teach that *sola fide* so that you might conveniently sin." And the average Catholic history of the Reformation to this day repeats that threadbare insinuation: Luther invented the doctrine of justification by faith alone to give room for sinning. To this day the Roman Church poses as the great protector of sanctification and a godly life. Cardinal Gibbons, in his *Faith of Our Fathers* (chap. III): "The Catholic Church is a society founded by our Lord Jesus Christ for the sanctification of its members. . . . The Church places His [Christ's] image over our altars, admonishing us to look and do according to the pattern shown on the Mount. . . . The Moral Law which the Catholic Church inculcates on her children is the highest and holiest standard of perfection ever presented to any people, and furnishes the strongest incentives to virtue." And not only Catholics, but many others, even some who call themselves Lutherans, chime in: This doctrine of justification, excluding sanctification, is a hindrance to good works; it puts a premium on wickedness, gives a soft pillow to the lazy; it makes people carnally secure, so that they remain unconverted; the Lutheran Church knows only how to teach one doctrine, that of justification by faith; all other doctrines, particularly that of sanctification, are slighted and neglected; of godliness they know little or nothing. So it is that in the Lutheran Church—and today chiefly in the Missouri Synod—a dead orthodoxy reigns; if it were not for such periodic revivals as that of Pietism, there would be no trace of spiritual life.

Yes, we must carry this attack on the doctrine of justification by faith even farther back than the Reformation. It is evident from St. Paul's epistles that, when he preached justification by faith alone, such an attack on this doctrine in the guise of a defense of sanctification was made. Take, e. g., Rom. 6:1: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid." Or, Gal. 2:17: "But, if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid." It is true, Paul himself here proposes these objections; but when we read that here and there he was followed by Judaistic teachers who decried the doctrine of free justification which he was preaching and claimed that Christians must again submit to the Mosaic Law, is it going too far afield when we conclude that Paul did not invent these objections but that this is exactly what those Judaists said: In teaching justification without works, you teach men to say, God's grace forgives all sin; He par-

dons all our mishaps; well, then we can go right on sinning, or at least we need not be so careful in our life, for God's grace will readily supply what we lack; yea, the more we sin, the more do we give opportunity to the grace of God to abound; and so we promote the honor of God. Paul answers, That's the logic of Old Adam. And so only blasphemous lips can draw the conclusion, Since Christ loves the sinners and forgives sin, therefore He loves sin, and Christians may sin gladly and without any scruples, simply casting all their sins on Christ. And St. Paul then enters on a discussion of Christian sanctification. So must we, to obviate any such objections on the part of others or of our own heart, have a clear conception of the Bible doctrine of sanctification and of the true relation between justification and sanctification. We must know, and we must show, that our Church does indeed insist on godliness, that it testifies to the necessity of a new, holy life as much as any other denomination, with the vast and powerful difference from some of them that we not only emphasize the necessity of sanctification but also teach clearly what true sanctification is and how a man can attain it.

Briefly, then, we must consider what the Bible, and accordingly our Lutheran Church, teaches and confesses of sanctification. We note, in the first place, that the term sanctification has a twofold meaning in Scriptures, in our Confessions, and in our theological literature. It is used in a wider meaning, which embraces every part of the divine work in and on man whereby he is led to salvation, the call of the Gospel, regeneration, illumination, conversion, justification, renewing, the final salvation. So Jesus prays for His disciples: "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth," John 17:17. To Paul, Jesus says that he shall be a witness to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me," Acts 26:18. So St. Paul writes to the Ephesians (5:25-27): "Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it that He might sanctify and cleanse it . . . that it should be holy and without blemish." And Heb. 10:17: "By one offering Christ hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Whenever the Scriptures speak of Christians as saints, as holy people, the reference is to sanctification in the wider sense, to the holiness of faith, of forgiveness of sins.

Our Confessions so use the word. The Third Article of the Apostles' Creed carries the title "Of Sanctification"; that means the entire work of the Holy Spirit. The Formula of Concord (793:8) states that the words "regeneration" and "vivification" are

used in the sense of justification; but "by these terms, in other places, the renewal of man is understood and distinguished from justification by faith."

There is a practical side to this. We read that St. Paul calls Christians perfect, 1 Cor. 2:6; Phil. 3:15; complete, Col. 2:10; we read that Luther writes: "We Christians are all saints, and cursed is he who does not call himself a saint and boast of it." (XII:1384.) If we forget that all these terms are used in the wider sense, we are apt to conclude, God's grace and the peace of Christ are promised only to saints; but I know that I am a sinner and not perfect; so that lets me out; there is no hope for me. There we must know that these titles refer to the holiness of faith, as St. Paul clearly shows, Phil. 3:12-15, when he calls Christians perfect, yet calls on them to be so minded as he had described himself: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect." And Luther says, A Christian *must* claim that he is holy, i. e., righteous in Christ. It may seem that this is pride, that true humility would say, I do not know whether I am holy. But that is only apparent humility; for whoever does not glory in his holiness in Christ denies His baptism, His Gospel, aye, Christ Himself, who is come to make us holy.

Here, however, in distinction from justification, we speak of sanctification in the narrower sense, of sanctification of life. What is it? It would be difficult to find a better definition than that offered in our *Doctrinal Theology* (A. L. Graebner): "Renovation, or sanctification, is the restitution of the divine image in the regenerate" (p. 226). Only too often we think of sanctification as a synonym for good works. It is vastly more; it is a total transformation of man in which gradually the divine image lost in the Fall is restored. "If any man be in Christ," says St. Paul, 2 Cor. 5:17, "he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." It is not merely an outward change, keeping the outside of the vessel clean, giving the old furniture a new coat of paint and varnish; good works are only a part of sanctification, only the visible evidence of sanctification. Essentially, the Formula of Concord states (795:19), Sanctification, or renewal, "consists in love to God and one's neighbor." It is a change of heart; and beginning in the heart, it is a total transformation, Rom. 12:2; 1 Thess. 5:23: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The new man gradually reassumes the image of Him that created him, Col. 3:10; all those divine traits begin to reappear which adorned the first human beings after the Creator had breathed into them the breath of life; more and more their life again

assumes the form of life in Paradise, until their transformation on earth ends in their conformation in heaven to the likeness of their Father in heaven.

This transformation has two terminal points. The Scriptures speak of these two terminals as putting off the old man and putting on the new man, Col. 3:9, 10. This is clarified by other passages: 1 Pet. 2:1: "Laying aside all malice and all guile and hypocrisies and envies and all evil speakings." Rom. 13:12: "Cast off the works of darkness." Titus 2:12: "Denying ungodliness and worldly lusts." Gal. 5:24: "Crucify the flesh, with the affections and lusts." On the other hand, Rom. 13:12: "Put on the armor of light." Titus 2:12: "Live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." In short, Eph. 4:22-24: "That ye put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." And the Apology (263) says that renewal designates two parts, mortification and quickening: "Of these two parts Paul speaks plainly Rom. 6:2, 4, 11, that we are dead to sin, which takes place by contrition and its terrors, and that we should rise again with Christ, which takes place when by faith we again obtain consolation and life. . . . One is putting off the body of sins; the other is the rising again through faith. Neither ought these words: mortification, quickening, putting off the body of sins, rising again, to be understood in a Platonic way, concerning a feigned change; but mortification signifies true terrors, such as those of the dying, which nature could not sustain unless it were supported by faith. . . . And quickening ought not be understood as a Platonic fancy, but as consolation which truly sustains life that is escaping in contrition."

To bring about this change is, of course, impossible for man himself. We are dead in trespasses and sins, Eph. 2:1. Of ourselves, we are not sufficient even to think anything as of ourselves, 2 Cor. 3:5. It is God who must change us from dead corpses to living beings; He does this through regeneration and conversion. It is, therefore, self-evident that sanctification can be found only in those in whom God has awakened this new life; all others are still dead. And while, after this awakening, man can himself do good, he can do so only by the powers which God gives and as God sets these powers in operation. How dependent even the regenerate are on God's help becomes more evident when we look at sanctification in the light of the terms Scripture uses in describing it. "Putting off the old man"; that means fight, bitter, unrelenting fight. "Putting on the new man"; that means work, hard, unceasing work. It is true, with the help of God, offered

in the means of grace, a Christian is sure of ultimate victory. How hard the battle will be, however, we may judge when Scriptures tell us that the old man must be drowned, must be crucified. At times it is necessary to cut off hand or foot, to tear out an eye, because it is better to enter the kingdom of God crippled or lame or blind than to miss it altogether.

Nor is this fight ever finished or this work ever done in this life; in other words, sanctification is never perfect, the divine image never completely restored, this side of eternity. Says the Formula of Concord (907:68): "For since we receive in this life only the first-fruits of the Spirit, and the new birth is not complete but only begun in us, the combat and struggle of the flesh against the spirit remains even in the elect and truly regenerate men; for there is a great difference perceptible among Christians not only in this, that one is weak and another strong in the spirit, but each Christian, moreover, experiences in himself that at one time he is joyful in spirit and at another fearful and alarmed; at one time ardent in love, strong in faith and hope, and at another cold and weak." Hence the many admonitions in Scripture addressed to Christians to increase in sanctification, Eph. 4:15; 2 Cor. 9:8; Col. 1:11; 1 Thess. 3:12; Phil. 1:10; 1 Thess. 4:1; etc.

The question is asked by all perfectionists, from Papists to Methodists: If God must give grace unto sanctification, why cannot He give sufficient grace unto perfection? It is an idle and useless question; it must suffice us that God does not do so; and real perfectionism denies Christian faith, for that rests on forgiveness of sin. Again people who have nothing better to do have asked, Which is the greater sin, perfectionism or neglect of sanctification? Dr. Pieper (*Christl. Dog.*, III, p. 41) points out that it is idle to speculate on the relative greatness of sins; Scripture says to the "Christian worldling": "For this ye know, that no whoremonger nor unclean person nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words; for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them," Eph. 5:5-7. And to the perfectionist Scripture says: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." "If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him [God] a liar, and His Word is not in us," 1 John 1:8, 10. In other words, unless they repent, they will both be damned. And at that we leave it.

Luther sums up what the Scriptures say of sanctification when, in his *Commentary on Galatians*, he says on Gal. 6:15: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature" (London translation, p. 543):

"Now, a new creature, whereby the image of God is renewed, is not made by any color or counterfeiting of good works, but by Christ, by whom it was created after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness. When works are done, they bring indeed a new show and outward appearance, wherewith the world and the flesh are delighted, but not a new creature; for the heart remaineth wicked as it was before, full of the contempt of God and infidelity. Therefore a new creature is the work of the Holy Ghost, which cleanseth our heart by faith (Acts 15:9) and worketh the fear of God, love, chastity, and other Christian virtues and giveth power to bridle the flesh and to reject the righteousness and wisdom of the world. Here is no coloring or new outward show but a thing done indeed. Here is created another sense and another judgment, that is to say, altogether spiritual, which abhorreth those things that before it greatly esteemed. The monkish life and order did so bewitch us in time past that we thought there was no other way to salvation. But now we judge of it far otherwise. We are now ashamed of those things which we adored as most heavenly and holy, before we were regenerated into this new creature. Wherefore the changing of garments and other outward things is not a new creature, as the monks dream, but it is the renewing of the mind by the Holy Ghost, after the which followeth a change of the members and senses of the whole body. For when the heart hath conceived a new light, a new judgment, and new motions through the Gospel, it cometh to pass that the inward senses are also renewed, for the ears desire to hear the Word of God and not the traditions and dreams of men. The mouth and tongue do not vaunt of their own works, righteousness, and rules; but they set forth the mercy of God only, offered to us in Christ. These changes consist not in words but are effectual and bring a new spirit, a new will, new senses, and new operations of the flesh, so that the eyes, ears, mouth, and tongue do not only see, hear, and speak otherwise than they did before, but the mind also approveth, loveth, and followeth another thing than it did before. For before, being blinded with papish errors and darkness, it imagined God to be a merchant who would sell unto us His grace for our works and merits. But now, in the light of the Gospel, it assureth us that we are counted righteous by faith only in Christ. Therefore it now rejecteth all will-works and accomplisheth the works of charity and of our vocation commended by God. It praiseth and magnifieth God; it rejoiceth and glorieth in the only trust and confidence of God's mercy through Jesus Christ. If it must suffer any trouble or affliction, it endureth the same cheerfully and gladly, although the flesh repine and grudge thereat. This Paul calleth a new creature."

## III

The chief objection against the doctrine of justification without works, purely by grace, through faith in the merits of Jesus Christ, is this, that thereby sanctification is set aside, that thereby Christians are permitted, perhaps even encouraged, to lead an impious, ungodly life. In leading over to the special topic of this discussion, the true relation between justification and sanctification, I want to ask and answer a question: Who are they that raise these objections to the doctrine of justification as it is taught by the Lutheran Church in accordance with the Word of God? Let us see.

In St. Paul's day there were those who protested that he made void the Law of God through faith, Rom. 3:31, that he taught a Christian might continue in sin, so that the grace of God might abound, Rom. 6:1. Who were they? Men from Judea, certain of the sect of the Pharisees, who believed, who said, that Christians must be circumcised and commanded to keep the Law of Moses, otherwise they could not be saved, Acts 15. Since the Reformation the most persistent people in raising that objection have been the Roman Catholics; and they teach, in the words of their own confession (Trent, Sess. 6, Cans. 9, 11, 24): "If any one saith that by faith alone the impious is justified in such wise as to mean that nothing else is required to cooperate in order to the obtaining the grace of justification, and that it is not in any way necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will: let him be anathema.—If any one saith that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and the charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost and is inherent in them; or even that the grace whereby we are justified is only the favor of God: let him be anathema.—If any one saith that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works, but that the said works are merely the fruits and signs of justification obtained but not a cause of the increase thereof: let him be anathema." The people who are so greatly concerned about the sanctification of Christians are the same people who claim that man must do good before he can be justified. Suspicious! And now you can go down the line of the modern critics of the Lutheran doctrine of justification, and you will usually find them false teachers who are trying to bring works into the deal of justification—from the crass paganism of Unitarians, through the Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, and synergism of the sects, down to those who claim that faith justifies as a God-pleasing work. Their camouflage is concern about the life of Christians lest they fall into hypocrisy; their contention

is, Christians will not do good works unless they get credit for them in justification.

Practically the same accusation was made against teaching and preaching in the Lutheran Church by the Pietists of the late seventeenth century. Conditions in the Church at about 1675 were bad, much merely external and formal Christianity that did not affect heart and life of church-members. Pietists said, The preaching in the Church is to blame: too much dead orthodoxy, too much stress on purity of doctrine and not enough personal application to life; that again meant: Too much justification and not enough sanctification. As a matter of historical fact, this was a very faulty conclusion; but they drew that conclusion and, as a result, grew very careless and neglectful of doctrinal preaching and teaching in their efforts to cultivate a godly life; and when Rationalism came to Germany from England and France, they had no weapon to fight it, and in a short time the University of Halle, headquarters of Pietism, had become the seat of Rationalism.

We see more clearly today. We shall not try to deny that there were preachers who were guilty of dead orthodoxy, just as there were some synergists and some Crypto-Calvinists. Some people have one-track minds. And when we remember the hard and long-continued battle Lutherans had to wage to retain the pure doctrine of justification, newly restored in the Reformation, extending to and beyond the adoption of the Formula of Concord, then we shall also understand how some fell into the habit of a one-sided stressing of pure doctrine. But we maintain that the real reason for deplorable conditions in the Church lay in the faulty church organization, the State Church organization, which precluded Christian church discipline and filled the church-governing consistories with politicians. Yet the cry has continued: In the Lutheran Church justification is overstressed; therefore conditions are not as they ought to be among their people. The accusation has been leveled chiefly at our Synod; and I have heard it said in our own circles when mention is made of evils and weaknesses: What we need is a little more Pietism. They don't know what Pietism was. What they mean is: We must stress sanctification more and justification less. Now, we cannot stress sanctification too much, and we cannot stress justification too much; but it is possible to neglect one or the other in our preaching; and above all, we can mistake and misrepresent the right relation between the two.

There is, according to Scripture, an inevitable and invariable connection between justification and sanctification. Inevitable; that is, one cannot be without the other; and where the one is, there the other will be, too. Invariable; that is, justification always

precedes sanctification, and sanctification always follows justification. Let it be said here, once for all, when we speak of justification preceding and sanctification following, we do not separate them chronologically; we only indicate the order, the logical relation between the two. I cannot do better here than to cite the classic word of the Formula of Concord (929, 41): ‘For good works do not precede faith, neither does sanctification precede justification. But first faith is kindled in us in conversion by the Holy Ghost from the hearing of the Gospel. This lays hold of God’s grace in Christ, by which the person is justified. Then, when the person is justified, he is also renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, from which renewal and sanctification the fruits of good works then follow. . . . This should not be understood as though justification and renewal were sundered from one another in such a manner that a genuine faith sometimes could exist and continue for a time together with a wicked intention, but hereby only the order (of causes and effects, of antecedents and consequents) is indicated, how one precedes or succeeds the other. For what Luther has correctly said remains true nevertheless: ‘Faith and good works well agree and fit together (are inseparably connected); but it is faith alone, without works, which lays hold of the blessing; and yet it is never and at no time alone.’”

Let us consider this a little more in detail and see that it is Scripture doctrine. Let us recall what we heard before, that sanctification does not merely consist in this, that a man quits all kinds of vices externally,—that a drinker, a blasphemer, an adulterer, quits the gross sin,—but in this, that a man becomes a new creature. There is no better description of this than that given by St. Paul in Eph. 2. We are by nature “dead in trespasses and sins.” Note, not dead in every respect; in this condition of death we could and did indeed “walk according to the course of this world; we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind.” But we were absolutely dead to all that is good and God-pleasing, “children of wrath, even as others.” “But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved,) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.” The Holy Spirit comes to us in the Gospel and quickens us, awakens life in us who are dead, by kindling faith in the Savior in our hearts. That is regeneration, the new birth. Now we are no longer dead but alive to all that is good, a new creature. Now we are no longer children of wrath; Christ’s righteousness has been imputed to

us, and we are justified before God; we are inwardly changed, dead to sin, Rom. 6:2, but alive to all good things.

In various ways Scripture pictures this process time and again. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," says Jesus, John 3:6, "and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Before a man can move, think, speak, or act, he must be born; and before he can think, speak, or do anything spiritually good, he must be spiritually born. That is regeneration. St. Paul says, Eph. 2:10: "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Before the world, the sun, and the moon, air, earth, and water could serve man, they had to be created and invested with the necessary qualities. So spiritually; God must create us spiritually before we can live a spiritual life; and that is regeneration. The corrupt tree must be changed into a good tree before it can bring forth good fruit, Matt. 7:16.

There was a time when man did not need the new birth. Before the Fall all that Adam and Eve did pleased God, because they were good and perfect, created in the image of God. By the Fall that was changed; now man is bad, and all that he does is bad. "When man does what is in him," Luther says, "he sins." "All our works are nothing but (with permission) lice in an old dirty fur, of which nothing clean can be made, in which, in brief, neither hide nor hair is good." Man must be entirely changed, become a new creature; that is done by regeneration. This new creature, this new-born man, now pleases God because the perfect righteousness of Christ is imputed to him; he is justified before God. And now all that he does pleases God. Not as though his works are intrinsically perfect. Before the Law of God even the works of the regenerate are not good; yet they please God. Why? There must be another reason for that than the perfection of what they do. The reason is found in justification. When man is regenerated his relation to God changes; he is pardoned, justified; he has become a child of God. And now all that he does is pleasing to God. Luther: "When you see or hear something brave and honest in the world, then say, Is Christ there, well and good; is Christ not there, then the devil surely is, though there be cap, cord, hair shirt, virtue, respectability, etc. In the eyes of the world it may be piety, holiness, etc., but in God's eyes it's all an abomination if Christ is not there."

There can be no sanctification without justification. On the other hand, sanctification inevitably follows justification. Inevitably, because according to Scripture justifying faith is always productive of good works. Scripture knows of no other faith than that which moves the mouth to confess, 2 Cor. 4:13; which moves the Christian to overcome the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the

eyes and the pride of life, 1 John 5:4; 2:16; which purifies the heart, Acts 15:9, and shines forth in good works, Matt. 5:16. This is what St. Paul so clearly states, Gal. 5:6: "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." "That is to say," Luther explains, "faith which is not feigned or hypocritical but true and lively. This is that faith which exerciseth and requireth good works through love. It is as much as to say, He that will be a true Christian indeed, or one of Christ's kingdom, must be a true believer. Now, he believeth not truly if works of charity follow not his faith. So on both hands, as well on the right hand as on the left, he shutteth hypocrites out of Christ's kingdom. On the left hand he shutteth out the Jews and all such as will work their own salvation, saying: 'In Christ neither circumcision, etc.'; that is to say, no works, no service, no worshiping, no kind of life in the world, but faith, without any trust in works or merits, availeth before God. On the right hand he shutteth out all slothful and idle persons, who say, If faith justify without works, then let us work nothing, but let us only believe and do what we list. Not so, ye enemies of grace. Paul saith otherwise. And although it be true that only faith justifieth, yet he speaketh here of faith in another respect; that is to say that, after it hath justified, it is not idle, but occupied and exercised in working through love. Paul therefore in this place setteth forth the whole life of a Christian man, namely, that inwardly it consisteth in faith towards God, and outwardly in charity and good works towards our neighbor."

(*Commentary on Galatians*, London, 447.)

This, too, is sufficient answer to those, Catholics and sects, who abuse this text to bring good works into justification. Faith justifies, so they say, because it worketh by love; so says St. Paul. But St. Paul never dreamt of saying that; that because is not in the text. What St. Paul does say is this: Faith alone justifies; of course, it must be true faith, not a sham faith; and this true faith you can tell by the fact that it worketh by love. That's the only kind of faith there is; all other so-called faith is sham and hence does not justify.

That is one of the reasons why we say, Sanctification is necessary; Christians *must* do good works. Objections have been raised against the use of these terms: "necessary" and "must." They have been abused and so misunderstood and used for false teaching. But they are Scriptural, and so we use them. Of course, good works are not necessary for salvation; that has been sufficiently shown in the first part of this paper; in the matter of justification all works, whether done before or after conversion, are entirely excluded. Included in this is that good works are not necessary

for the preservation of faith. While it is true that a wicked, unchristian life will destroy faith, to say that good works preserve faith is turning things upside down; good works neither produce nor preserve faith, but faith produces good works. Again, when we say a Christian *must* do good works, this does not imply any constraint, or coercion, on the part of God nor any unwillingness on the part of the Christian, not that sanctification is a heavy and burdensome yoke, laid on us by God, as though our good works were produced by dire threats of wrath and condemnation. The meaning is, in the first place, that sanctification is the inevitable result of the new life implanted by justifying faith. Again, I cannot improve Luther's exposition (XI:936 — Lenker, XII:187): "Now, since there is no other means for taking away sins than Christ, you might ask: How is it, then, that we are nevertheless required to do good works; if, as you say, all depends upon faith? I reply: Where faith is genuine, it cannot exist without good works. Just as, on the other hand, where there is unbelief, there can be no good work. Hence, if you believe, there must necessarily follow from your faith naught but good works. For, as faith brings you salvation and eternal life, so it also brings you good works; they cannot be restrained. Just as a living person cannot refrain from moving about, eating and drinking and laboring, it being impossible that such activities should cease while he lives, no one need command and drive him to do such works, but, spare his life, and he'll do them; just as all this is true in the physical life, so nothing more is required, in order that good works may be done, than faith. Only believe, and you will do all of your own accord."

In the second place, sanctification is necessary, and Christians must do good works because that is the will of God. Sanctification, or doing good works, is not an adiaphoron, something neither commanded nor forbidden by God and therefore left to man's free choice; it is enjoined on us by God's Word. It is impossible here even to mention all the Bible-passages; a few must suffice. 1 Thess. 4:3: "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." That is not an error of the Perfectionists, Methodists, and the like, that God wants us to be holy. 1 Pet. 2:21, 22: "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow His steps; who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth." Christ has delivered us from the guilt and punishment of sin; but that does not give us a license to live in sin; we should now live under Him in His kingdom and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness. Moreover, the Lord warns us specifically that no man must presume upon the grace of God in Christ. Heb. 12:14: "Follow peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." No; sanctification is not a cause of

salvation; but the Lord warns us: Sanctification is not a mere appendix, a side issue in Christian life; on the contrary, it is so inseparably combined with Christianity that no one can be a Christian and saved who despises sanctification and serves sin. The God who in times gone by sent the Deluge and destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah with fire has not changed in New Testament times. Let no one imagine: Since Christ has atoned for our sins, God has become a careless, negligent father; hence we need no longer fear Him; no need to walk so carefully. That is a terrible delusion. God's wrath against sin has not ceased; the death of Christ has not changed that in the least. Gal. 5:19-21 the apostle names the sins of the flesh, and then adds: "of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

Finally — and so we close the grand circle of God's great plan of salvation — the end and final object of our justification is our perfect sanctification. Said Dr. Walther in an essay presented in 1875: "Holy Scripture teaches most clearly that the final purpose of the work of redemption is sanctification. Pardon, atonement, and justification is not the final goal, but only the means and way whereby sanctification is made possible. God forgives our sin in order that we may be rid of sin" (dass wir aus der Suende kommen sollen). "Christ is our Redeemer because He has freed us not only from guilt and punishment but altogether from sin. Perfectly this is accomplished only in the life to come. . . . Christ has earned forgiveness of sin for us in order to make new men of us. In heaven we shall need no forgiveness, for we shall be like God. Not so do we become holy, as the enthusiasts say, that here we strip off all sin, but we teach, as St. John teaches: 'We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is. . . . By our knowledge of God our sanctification is accomplished. As far as a man knows God, he is holy. Here we know Him only in part; therefore our sanctification is imperfect. In eternity our knowledge of God will be perfect, and there we shall be altogether holy. But our sanctification must begin here; otherwise we do not attain it in all eternity. He who dies without God is without God eternally. He who dies without grace is without grace eternally. He who dies without sanctification is full of sin eternally.'

That is Scripture doctrine. Luke 1:74, 75: "That we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life." That is the purpose for which Christ has delivered us from our enemies, sin, death, devil, hell, and the wrath of God, that we serve God in righteousness and holiness. Our sanctification is designated as aim and purpose of our redemption. The entire sixth

and eighth chapters of Romans have the purpose to impress upon us that Christ has redeemed us from guilt and punishment of sin to the end that we become new men, that the image of God, lost through sin, might be restored in us, here in time imperfectly, but increasingly; there in eternity perfectly. 2 Cor. 5:15: "He died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again": Christ died to earn for all men grace, forgiveness of sin, the righteousness that avails before God. But that is not the final aim. The final aim is our salvation; and that embraces above all things this, that we get rid of that sin which separates us from God, that the divine image be restored in us and we again become like God. This is what Christ designed when He died for us. Eph. 2:10: "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." That is the purpose for which God has newly created us. Note that in this doctrine of grace good works occupy a more prominent place than in the doctrine of salvation by works; there they are only a means of exchange; here they are an end and purpose in themselves, for which Christ has redeemed us and God has made us new creatures. 1 Pet. 2:9: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light." That's what the Church is for: to show forth, to reveal to men, the excellencies of the God whom we serve; by words, of course, but chiefly by our whole life.—Luther says (XVI:2241): "Christ is therefore Christ or has earned redemption from sin and death that the Holy Spirit should make us new men out of the Old Adam, that we should die to sin and live unto righteousness, as St. Paul teaches Rom. 6, this to begin and continue here on earth and reach perfection there. For Christ has earned for us not only *gratiam*, grace, but also *donum*, the gift of the Holy Ghost, that we should have not only forgiveness of sins but also ceasing from sin." Cp. XII:559.

So we close the circle. God made man perfect, in His own image. In His benevolence He prepared heaven and provided that man, after spending his appointed time on earth, should there live with Him in perfect bliss. Man crossed that design of God; he sinned. Then God in His grace resolved to redeem lost mankind. He laid their sins on His own Son, who atoned for them; and God said to man: Your sin is cancelled; here is the perfect righteousness acquired for you; take it. He who accepts it in faith is justified in God's sight; God is his reconciled Father; heaven is his home. Together with the kindling of that justifying faith, and at the same time, the Holy Spirit restores to man that spiritual life lost in the Fall; and at once the Christian begins to live the

life that Adam and Eve lived in Paradise; and while it is an up-hill struggle, in the end the new man prevails; the divine image restored, he enters the kingdom prepared for him from the foundation of the world.

Let us close with a few conclusions. Luther by the grace of God recognized what all previous reformers had overlooked or had passed by with a casual glance, that the real mystery of iniquity, the real abomination of desolation in the Church at that time, was the false doctrine of justification. When Erasmus, in selfish fear of losing his pensions, looked for a teaching of the Roman Church which he could defend with least violation of his conscience, picking free will and setting forth the Roman Pelagianism, Luther wrote: "Du bist mir an die Gurgel gefahren"—you have seized me by the throat. To this day the really vicious falsehood in the Roman Church is their false doctrine of justification, their condemnation of the Scripture doctrine of justification. That's the real mark of Antichrist. The reason why sectarian churches refuse to call the Pope the Antichrist is that they, too, have lost the pure doctrine of justification, teaching synergism, man's participation in justification, and so have become more or less close relatives of the Papacy. And the reason why even among Lutherans today there is some hesitation about calling the Pope the Antichrist is this, that they have lost the full appreciation of this cardinal doctrine of Christian truth. It is significant that today practically every history puts the so-called Catholic Reformation, the Counter-Reformation, on the same level with the Lutheran Reformation, that not a few of them echo the Roman plea: Too bad that Luther lost his temper and separated from the Roman Church; if he had only given them time, they would have worked out a reformation, as they did in the Council of Trent, without this sad split in the Church — when, as a matter of fact, the Council of Trent put its stamp of approval on every false doctrine of the Middle Ages and adopted only some mild resolutions for moral reform.

It is as necessary today to stress justification by faith alone in our preaching and writing as ever before. Let no preacher think it is easy and beneath his dignity and not doing justice to his learning ever again to reiterate these elementary truths; if you look closely, perhaps it is not so easy at all; and easy or not, it is essential. Let no hearer think that he knows it so well that he need not hear it again, that there is no need of his going to church if his pastor does not preach something more advanced. Perhaps not all people in the church are as wise as you; and perhaps, if you only look closely, you are not as wise as you imagine.

We must continue to make justification the center of our

preaching. That alone can give us certainty of our salvation; only if you know that God justifies without any work, by faith alone in the merits of Christ, can you be sure that God is gracious to *you*. And only such preaching can produce true sanctification. Do not let it disturb you when people say, The Lutheran Reformation was a reformation of doctrine but not of life; in the Protestant sects there is more preaching on sanctification and good works; people are urged to act more than in the Lutheran Church, where there is more preaching about what God has done for man than what man should now do in obedience to God's will. Unless it is done rightly, it is taffy for your self-righteous Old Adam. And there is some one else behind it. Luther said: "Primarily, before all works, you hear the Word of God, wherein the Holy Spirit reproves the world of sin, John 16:9. After sin is recognized, you hear of God's grace in Christ. In the same Word comes the Spirit and gives faith wherever and whomever He will. Then begins the slaying (of Old Adam) and the cross and the works of love. Whoever proposes another order to you, do not doubt, it is the devil."

Surely, we must preach sanctification. Because of the unending battle between the old and the new man in us we need the constant reminder that this fight is necessary, and we need instruction how this fight must be carried on and what it must produce. We must apply this personally to the individual and his life, exercise brotherly admonition and Christian discipline in the congregation. But above all we must see to it that sanctification proceeds from the right source. To produce good fruit, it will not do to dig around an old bad tree, to fertilize it and water it; you must plant a new tree. All the aim of our Lutheran preaching is to produce people who alone can bring forth good works, and this can be done only by the preaching of faith. No law can make people pious; you can't turn thieves into respectable men by putting them behind iron bars. Good works must be motivated by love and gratitude; and that is the result of the preaching of grace. That will open the fountain which without command will gush forth Christian virtues. Such preaching will not make people secure; on the contrary, this alone will lead them to be "careful to maintain good works," Titus 3:8, will lead them to do the will of God gladly and joyfully.

We close with Luther's eulogy on faith (Holman, VI, 451): "Faith is not that human notion and dream that some hold for faith. Because they see that no betterment of life and no good works follow it and yet they can hear and say much about faith, they fall into error and say, 'Faith is not enough; one must do works in order to be righteous and be saved.' This is the reason

that, when they hear the Gospel, they fall to . . . and make for themselves, by their own powers, an idea in their hearts which says, 'I believe.' This they hold for true faith. But it is a human imagination and idea that never reaches the depth of the heart, and so nothing comes of it and no betterment follows it. Faith, however, is a divine work in us. It changes us and makes us to be born anew of God (John 1); it kills the Old Adam and makes altogether different men in heart and spirit and mind and powers, and it brings with it the Holy Ghost. Oh, it is a living, busy, active, mighty thing, this faith; and so it is impossible for it not to do good works incessantly. It does not ask whether there are good works to do, but before the question rises, it has already done them and is always at the doing of them. He who does not these works is a faithless man. He gropes and looks about after faith and good works, and knows neither what faith is nor what good works are though he talks and talks with many words about faith and good works. Faith is a living, daring confidence in God's grace, so sure and certain that a man would stake his life on it a thousand times. This confidence in God's grace and knowledge of it makes men glad and bold and happy in dealing with God and with all His creatures; and this is the work of the Holy Ghost in faith. Hence a man is ready and glad, without compulsion, to do good to every one, to serve every one, to suffer everything, in love and praise of God, who has shown him this grace; and thus it is impossible to separate works from faith, quite as impossible as to separate heat and light from fire."

Through justification unto sanctification.—When the Lord today asks us, "Will ye also go away?" may He give us grace to answer with Peter, "Lord, whither shall we go? Thou hast words of eternal life."

THEO. HOYER

---

## Luther: A Blessing to the English

---

### I. "The Lutheran Invasion"

In the eighth century the English monk Winfrid came over to preach his Gospel to the Thuringians, was martyred for his pains, and became known to fame as St. Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans.

Eight hundred years later a German monk of that same Thuringia had a special love for the English for their work and made a return gift of his Gospel. The Catholic Joseph Clayton, an Oxford man, writes: "Luther, by his writings and through his disciples, brought the Protestant teaching to Great Britain, and from England and Scotland this Protestant teaching spread to North

America and to all British colonies and dominions. . . . Whatever the varieties of Protestant teaching, they all derive from Luther."

Should it not interest all, especially all Protestants, more especially all English-speaking people, and most especially all English-speaking Lutherans, to know how Lutheranism came to the English? The following pages will try to give the answer.

Luther posted his Ninety-five Theses on Indulgences on October 31, 1517.

In November Cardinal Wolsey received Pope Leo's bull relating to the building of St. Peter's Church and the appointment of a banker for the money received by preaching the indulgence offered. King Henry demanded a rake-off of the plunder. The Pope offered a quarter; the king's agent, the bishop of Worcester, demanded a third. The Pope also requested from the clergy a subsidy for the Holy See. A Pope said, "Truly, England is our storehouse of delights: a very inexhaustible well; and where so much abounds, much can be extorted from many."

Chancellor Bishop Fisher of Cambridge had Pope Leo's proclamation of indulgences affixed to the gate of the common schools. In the following night a student wrote above it, "Blessed is the man that maketh the Lord his trust and respecteth not the proud nor such as turn to lies." Ps. 40:4.

Old Thomas Fuller says: "Inquiry was made about the party, but no discovery was made. Whereupon Bishop Fisher solemnly proceeded to excommunication, which he is said to perform with tears and great gravity."

The heretic was a Norman student by the name of Peter de Valence.

The Rt. Rev. Mons. Patrick O'Hare finds Luther's theses "erroneous, inconsistent, satirical, merely puerile." He simply does not recognize dynamite. Prof. Peter Guilday of the Catholic University of America at Washington knows they "set Europe ablaze," and he speaks of "the militant figure of the man who centered Europe, political and religious, around himself at the Diet of Worms, three years afterwards."

Erasmus, the peerless leader of the literary lights, also saw Luther had something there and as early as March 1, 1518, sent the live wire to Dean John Colet of St. Paul's with the comment: "The court of Rome clearly has lost all sense of shame; for what could be more shameless than those continued indulgences? . . . The princes conspire with the Pope and perhaps with the Turk against the happiness of the people."

On the 5th he sent them to Bishop John Fisher of Rochester, a learned and saintly man, with the remark: "The shamelessness of the Roman curia has reached its climax."

On the same day he sent a number of Luther's tracts to his "Democritus," Sir Thomas More, whom Anthony Wood rates "the greatest prodigy of wit England has hitherto produced."

A little later he wrote Cardinal Wolsey, the personal representative of Leo X, "God on earth," and himself "seven times more powerful than the Pope": "The man's life is approved by the unanimous consent of all, and the fact that his character is so upright that even enemies find nothing to slander must considerably prejudice us in his favor."

As early as June 24 Secretary Richard Pace writes Wolsey the king was pleased with the praise given his book by the cardinal and all other great learned men — repeated four days later. Prof. J. S. Brewer of King's College, London, the editor of *Letters and Papers*, holds this the draft of Henry's book against Luther of 1521. Bernard André, the poet, is credited with getting the king into this theological fight. As early as 1518 John Higes was accused of favoring the teaching of Luther, openly pronouncing that Luther had more learning in his little finger than all the doctors in England in their whole bodies, and that all the priests were blind and had led the people the wrong way. *Fox, Acts and Monuments*, IV, 179 (quoted by Charles Hob in his *Manual of English Church History*, 1910).

Wolfgang Capito gathered Luther's writings, and John Froben of Basel pirated them in 1518, reprinted them the same year and the next.

On February 14, 1519, Froben wrote Luther: "Blasius Salomonius, a printer of Leipzig, gave me some of your books, which he had bought at the last Frankfurt Fair, which, as they were approved by all the learned, I at once reprinted. We have sent six hundred copies to France and Spain; they are sold at Paris and are even read and approved by the doctors of the Sorbonne, as certain of our friends have assured us; for some of the most learned say that they have hitherto missed among those who treat Scripture the same freedom that you show. Francis Calvus, also a bookseller of Pavia, a most learned man, one devoted to the Muses, has taken a good part of your books to Italy to distribute them among all the cities. Nor does he do it so much for gain as to aid piety. He has promised to send epigrams written in your honor by all the learned in Italy, so much does he like your constancy and skill. . . . We have exported your books to Brabant and England. . . . We have sold out all your books except ten copies and never remember to have sold any more quickly."

Erasmus wrote Luther on May 30, 1519: "Dearest brother in Christ, I cannot tell you what commotion your books are raising

here [at Louvain]. In England there are men who think well of your writings, and they the very greatest."

One of Luther's works bears the coat of arms of the Duchess of Suffolk — most likely the fourth wife of the duke, a brother-in-law of the king.

"The effect of Luther's writings in England this year was the bringing some unhappy people to the stake at Coventry," says Gloucester Ridley in his *Nicholas Ridley*, the martyr.

In December the Pope permitted Wolsey to punish disorderly cloisters and "such as have lapsed into Lutheranism" — as early as 1519!

On February 28, 1520, Sir Thomas More wrote Edward Lee, the king's chaplain: "Should Leo withdraw his approval of Erasmus's New Testament, Luther's attack on the Holy See were piety itself compared with such a deed."

On March 3, G. Cowper wrote his father at London: "As for newes ther ys none, but of late ther was herytykes here which did take Luters opinyons."

Looking over the day-book of John Dorne for 1520, we see that Dutchman at Oxford sold the following books of Luther at the prices noted:

	S   d
1 opera luteri ligata	3 10
1 opera luteri ligata	4
1 condemnatio luteri	4
[three editions in 1520]	
1 disputatio lupsie luteri	4
1 luter ad gallatas	1 4
1 luter de potestate pape	3
1 luter de potestate pape	3
1 luter de potestate pape	}
1 resolutio luteri ligata	1
1 resolutio luteri	}
3 parvi libri luteri de potestate cum aliis	6

It may be of interest to know a pound of beef cost a half penny. Though he had a wealthy father, Sir Thomas More as a student at Oxford had to live on a penny a day.

In May Erasmus wrote Melanchthon: "It was decided to burn Luther's books in England, but I stopped this by writing letters to Cardinal Wolsey." He wrote the same to Oecolampadius.

On the 24th he wrote Archbishop William Warham of Canterbury, regretting Luther's violent language.

On the 28th Bishop Silvester de Giglis of Worcester wrote Wolsey from Rome: "Some months ago the works of Friar Martin arrived. Much of their contents is disapproved of by great theologians by reason of the scandals to which they might give rise, and part is condemned as heretical. After long debates it has been

decreed by the cardinals to declare M. a heretic, and a bull is in preparation on the subject, of which I will send a copy." It was published on July 15, 1520.

Wolsey at once forbade the circulation of Luther's books.

When King Henry and King Francis met on the most magnificent Field of Cloth of Gold in June, 1520, Henry spoke to Erasmus about "writing against Luther." The king of scholars begged off, not able to do so.

On January 1, 1521, Nicholas Wilson alludes to the rapid spread of Lutheranism, the activity and pertinacity of its supporters,—the confusion and dissensions occasioned by it. Unequal to the task alone, Luther surrounded himself with shrewd men, who were at the same time excellent scholars, but more studious of popularity than truth. His influence over them is such that when once they have adopted his teaching, they despise all others, consider themselves the exclusive possessors of sacred learning, and wrest the Scriptures to their will. "When Luther has once rendered them invincible, he teaches them to simulate constancy, frugality, labor, humility, the greatest order and zeal for propagating the glory of Christ, and equal grief and indignation against any who oppose (what they call) sound doctrine;—in short, every virtue which pertains to probity or holiness of life." Luther is a very learned man, and one who would have been the greatest ornament to the Church of Christ if his innocence had equaled his learning. But he has now become so insanely arrogant as to claim for himself the exclusive interpretation of Scripture; taxing the fathers of the Church with blindness, inconsistency, and error. He alone is on Christ's side, and all who contradict him are heretics.

On January 21, 1521, Ambassador Cuthbert Tunstad at the Reichstag of Worms writes Wolsey: "The Germans are so addicted to Luther that, rather than he should be oppressed by the Pope's authority, who had already condemned his opinions, they were resolved to spend a hundred thousand of their lives in his defense. They have informed the emperor that he is a good and virtuous man, besides his learning. He offereth to make his defense and revoke those opinions which he cannot defend by Holy Scripture. . . . His declaration [for burning the Pope's bull and decretals] he put in print in the Dutch tongue and sent it all about the country; which declaration by some idle fellow hath been translated into Latin, which I send your Grace herein enclosed, to the intent that you may see it and burn it when ye have done, and also that Your Grace may call before you the printers and booksellers, and give them strait charge that they bring none of his books into England, nor translate them into English, &c.

"He hath written a book since his condemnation, *De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae*. . . . They say there is much strange opinion in it near to the opinions of Boheme; I pray God keep that book out of England. At the exequy of the Cardinal of Croy, in the presence of the electors, the emperor, the Pope's ambassador, and the cardinals, a friar preacher made a sermon, and in the beginning said the Pope was Vicarius Christi in spiritualibus and the cardinals and the bishops were Apostoli, &c. But how his tongue turned in his head I cannot tell; but after he concluded that the emperor, when they do amiss, should reform their abuses, even to deposition; whereupon the Pope's Nuncius, having commission against Luther, called him, laying the premises to his charge; which said nuncius hath been openly threatened by many gentlemen not to intermeddle with him. In his said sermon he exhorted the emperor and all the princes to go into Italy, which is of the empire, and to reform such abuses as be there; whereunto I understand many of the princes be inclined, because every man thinketh to gain thereby. The said friar preacher is since ordained to preach here all Lent, by whom I know not.

"Luther offereth, if the emperor will go to Rome to reform the Church, to bring him 100,000 men, whereunto the emperor, as a virtuous prince, will not hearken. The said Luther hath many great clerks that hold with him save in some points, which the said Luther hath put forth more than he can or will justify, to the intent that on the residue he might be heard and a council called for reformation, whereof the Pope will not hear, but standeth to his sentence."

The preacher was John Faber, court preacher to Kaisers Max and Karl. What he advised had been advised by Luther in the *Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* in 1520.

On February 2, 1521, Sir Thomas Spinelly from the Reichstag at Worms wrote Wolsey: "As to Lutero, he — a certain governor — esteemed that matter of great importance, and very difficile to be remedied and extincted." Some one wrote to some one: "The diet will take notice of the books made by frier Martine Lutero a schismatic against the courte of Rome. Some one caused the seid booke to be brynned. . . . The whiche frier Martine of the elector of Saxson and other princes of this contre is favored." The Pope's curse was disregarded, and Luther's works were devoured with greater avidity than before.

Writings and seals "set up at the abbey of Boxley against the ill opinions of Martin Luther" were pulled down by Priest Adam Bradshawe in June, for which he went to prison.

On July 12 Jerome Ghinucci begs Wolsey to have the books of Luther he sent from Rome looked at by learned men, as the

Pope wishes to know if they are satisfactory, and likewise to have the replies made by Cardinal S. Sixtus to certain doubts moved by some learned men, and to arrange that Luther's books be not publicly sold.

When the papal nuncio, Jerome Aleander, told the printers Luther's books were forbidden throughout the empire, they said: "We will send them to England"; and they did. Polydore Vergil, the Italian bishop of Bath, says in his *History of England*, a great number of Lutheran books were in the hands of the people in 1521.

The "vicious and dissolute" Bishop Richard Nix of Norwich complained about the spread of heresy in his diocese; but Wolsey said he had no power from Rome to burn books of Lutheran gravity, and so show the devotion which England has always had to the Holy See. Cardinal Giulio de Medici, cousin of Pope Leo and his right hand, answered the Pope thinks Wolsey has power enough. Has ordered the original bull to be sent, requesting him to have it published and condemn the works of Luther. Sends him a copy of a book put out by that damnable heretic, for which not the book but he should be condemned to the flames. He desires nothing more than the suppression of Lutheranism and wishes the king to send an ambassador to the Emperor to urge him in this good cause. The Pope thinks a general bonfire would be more satisfactory than the prohibition of the importation.

On March 16 Pope Leo thanks Wolsey for his zeal against Luther and for forbidding the introduction of his books into England.

On the 29th Silvester de Giglis sends Richard Pace, the king's chief secretary, a pamphlet just written by a learned man against Martin Luther.

On April 17 Pope Leo permitted "the great God and Cardinal Wolsey" to read and refute Luther's books, which should be burned.

On October 20 the king ordered all to help his confessor, Bishop John Longland of Lincoln, to root out the "no small number of heretics" for which Lincoln was notorious. Above five hundred were forced to recant. Some had recited the Ten Commandments in English in their own homes, and others had spread Matthew and Mark in English. Six were burned. John Scrivener's daughter had to burn her own father; the same in the case of one Tylesworthy.

On the 10th John Clerk wrote Wolsey the Pope said, in condemning the errors of Luther, the Gallican Church had sanctioned as many errors against the Roman Church.

In 1521 More's daughter Margaret was married to William Roper, who was converted by Luther's *Christian Liberty* and *Babylonian Captivity* and became "a violent advocate of justifi-

cation by faith, and arguments and danger of punishment failed to move him." He was "a marvelous zealous Protestant and so fervent and withal so properly liked of himself and his divine learning that . . . neither was he contented to whisper it in hugger-mugger, but thirsted very sore to publish his new doctrine and divulge it, and thought himself very able to do so and it were even at Paul's Cross."

More asked Roper with a smile if it were not enough that his friends should know him to be a fool, but that he would have his folly proclaimed to the world.

He was "convented of heresy" before Cardinal Wolsey, "but for love borne by the cardinal to Sir Thomas More, his father-in-law, was, with a friendly warning, discharged."

More said to his daughter, "Meg, I have borne a long time with thy husband, I have reasoned and argued with him in those points of religion and still given him my poor fatherly counsel, but I perceive none of all this can call him home again. And therefore, Meg, I will no longer argue or dispute with him, but will clean give him over and get me another while to God and pray for him."

Later Roper "turned him again to the Catholic faith."

More commended the happy state of the realm: "Truth it is indeed, son Roper, and yet I pray God that some of us, as high as we seem to sit upon the mountains treading heretics under our feet like ants, live not the day that we gladly would wish to be at league and composition with them, to let them have their churches quietly to themselves, so that they would be contented to let us have ours quietly to ourselves."

More's brother-in-law, John Rastell, a lawyer and printer, also became a Lutheran.

On March 8, 1521, Archbishop Warham wrote Cardinal Wolsey: "I am enformyd that diverse of that Universitie [Oxford] be infectyd with the heresyes of Luther and of others of that sorte, havyng emong theym a grete nomber of books of the saide perverse doctrine which were forboden. . . .

"It is a sorrowful thing to see howe gredyly inconstaunt men, and specyally inexpert youthe, fallith to newe doctrynes, be they never so pestilent. . . . I wold I hadd suffered grete Payne, in condition this hadd not fortuned ther, wher I was brought up in lernyng. . . .

"Ptyie yt wer that through the lewdnes of on or two cankerd members, whiche as I understand have enducyd no small nombre of yong and incircumspect foles to give ere unto thaym, the hole Universitie shuld run in thinfamy of soo haynouse a cryme, the heryng wherof shuld be right delectable and plesant to the open Lutheranes beyond the See, and secrete behyther, wherof they

wold take harte and confydence that theyr pestilent doctrynes shuld encrese and multiply, seyng bothe the Universities of Inglande enfectid therewith, wherof the on hathe many yeeres been vovd of all heyrseyes, and the other hathe afore nowe taken apon hyr the prayse that she was never defyled; and nevertheless nowe is thought to be the originall occasion and cause of the fall in Oxford.

"By thes my writing I intende in nowise to move, but that the capitaynes of the said erroneus doctrynes be punishede to the ferefull example of all other. But if all the hole nombyr of yong scolers syspectyd in this cause (which as the Universitie writeth to me be marvelouse sory and repentaunt that they ever had any such books or redde or herde any of Luther's opynyons) shuld be callyd up to London, yt shuld engendre grete obloquy and sclandre to the Universitie, bothe behyther the See and beyonde, to the sorrow of all good men, and the pleasure of heretyks, desyering to have many folowers of thayr mischef; and (as it is thought) the lesse brute the better, ffor thavoyding wherof the said University hathe desyred me to move your Grace to be so good and gracyouse unto thaym, to gyve in commission to some sadd father which was brought up in the Universitie of Oxford to syt ther, and examyne, not the heads . . . but the novicyes which be not yet throughly cankerd in the said errors, and to put thaym to suche correction as the qualitie of thair transgression shall require. . . .

"Item, the said Universitie hathe desierd me to move your good Grace to . . . my lorde of Rochestre or my lorde of London to note out besyde . . . werks of Luther condemnyd alredy, the names of all other suche names of writers, Luthers adherents and fautors, as they preceyve to be erroneous and repugnant to Catholique feythe. . . . For I undrestand ther be many of thos newe writers as yll as Luther. And therfor it needeth this gret provision to be made for stopping of thaym, as of Luthers."

On April 3 the Archbishop tells the Cardinal of his intention of reading certain most damnable works of Luther sent by Wolsey's chaplain, Dr. Sampson. He will return in ten days to Lambeth and then confer with Wolsey upon them.

Bishop John Longland of Lincoln wrote Wolsey in April: "Ther is a monche of Saint Edmundsbury called Doctor Rowham whiche preached the fourth Sunday of Quadragesimae att St. Peters in Oxon. the mooste seditious Sermone ye have herd of, in raylyng agenste your Grace and Byshopes for this sequestration of evyll prechers, maynteynyng certayn opynyons of Luther, comfortyng erronymous persones in ther opynyons, saying, 'Fear not them who kill the body,' whiche I feare me hath and will doo moche hurt."

He urges Wolsey to have a notable clerk at Paul's Cross to preach afore you a sermon against Luther, the Lutherans, their

favorers, against their works and books, and against those bringing them into the kingdom. The guilty ought to be burned. The King thinks Bishop Fisher of Rochester to be the most meet to make that sermon.

Wood's *Annals* tells us of 1521: "While these things were in doing, certain persons of Martin Luther's faction (as they were now called) were busy in Oxford in dispersing his doctrine and books. So far, it seems, were they spread in a short time through several parts of the Nation, that the Cardinal wrote to the Universitie to appoint certain men from among them to go up to London, to examine and search his opinions that were predominant against the articles of Holy Faith. Whereupon, after consultation had, they appointed Thomas Brinknell, John Kynton, John Roper, and John de Coloribus, doctors of divinity, who, meeting at that place divers learned men and bishops in a solemn Convocation in the Cardinal's House, and finding his doctrine to be for the most part repugnant to the present used in England, solemnly condemned it, a testimony of which was afterwards sent to Oxford, and fastened on the dial of St. Mary's Churchyard by Nicholas Kratzer, the maker and contriver thereof and his books also burnt both here and at Cambridge." Kratzer was born at Muenchen, became a Bachelor of Arts at Wittenberg, a fellow of Corpus Christi College at Oxford on July 4, 1517, and in 1520 the king's "Estronomyer," at hundred shillings the quarter. "He made the old dial in Corpus Christi College garden; and that standing on a pillar in St. Mary's south churchyard, in High Street of the city of Oxon."

Thus the Reformation, made in Germany, came to England. Cardinal Gasquet correctly calls it "the Lutheran invasion."

Oak Park, Ill.

(To be continued)

W. DALLMANN



### The Progressive Revelation of the Antichrist

That there have been many antichristian forces, many "anti-christs" in the world since the days of our blessed Savior, that, in fact, they had their origin in apostolic times, is clearly stated in Holy Scripture, as in 1 John 2:18; 4:3; 2 John 7. Our knowledge of this fact, therefore, and our belief in this truth, is based upon a teaching, a doctrine, of the Bible.

That, in addition, there would come *one great Antichrist*, one whose antecedents would go back to the days of the apostles, is just as clearly and emphatically stated in Holy Scripture. Cp. 1 John 4:3; 2 Thess. 2:3-12 (also the pertinent passages in Daniel and in the Book of Revelation). The Biblical basis for the doctrine of the Antichrist, as held by the Lutheran Church and by many others,

has been sufficiently, even exhaustively, treated by many Biblical commentators and also in the pages of this journal.<sup>1)</sup> (See Vol. II, 241—244; IV, 424—435.) The present paper is intended only to follow the development of this phenomenon of the Antichrist through the centuries, with particular emphasis upon such incidents in the history of dogma and of the Church as will enable the student of Scripture and of history to appreciate the truly diabolical ingenuity which has attended the growth of the antichristian teaching and the antichristian power from its inception, in apostolic days, to its present position of unprecedented authority and influence, not only in the ecclesiastical, but even in the temporal domain.

Here are the most significant facts. Paul had spoken of the "mystery of iniquity" as already working, and he had named some of the characteristics of the "man of sin," the "son of perdition," namely, a falling away from the truth of the apostolic preaching, an opposing and exalting himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, a placing himself in the temple of God and showing himself that he is God, a coming after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, together with other marks by and through which that man of sin would be clearly *revealed*, so that he could be definitely recognized by all who followed the Scriptural explanation and description; *hence the warning* that the Christians should let no man deceive them by any means. To these facts, listed by Paul about the middle of the first century, the Apostle John has added as a specific characteristic of antichristian movements in general and the one great Antichrist in particular that he would not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, namely, as the one and only Savior of mankind. To these characteristics we might add others spoken of, for example, in the prophecy of Daniel and in the Book of Revelation, also in 1 Tim. 4:1-3, which certainly present other antichristian traits, but the enumeration as given above will suffice.

As both Paul and John affirm, the antichristian forces which were to find their final exponent, their climax, in the one great Antichrist, were at work even in the first century, in its sixth and tenth decades. As John puts it, this spirit of Antichrist was "even now already in the world," 1 John 4:3. Certain manifestations of his influence were even then observable. We may readily concede that Judaizing tendencies and incipient Gnosticism were symptoms of antichristian leaven, but they were, in their own specific form,

---

1) The reader is referred, in this connection, to monographs by Brochmand, Dannhauer, Hoenegg, Fick, Philippi, Zapf, and the many exhaustive discussions of the subject in the standard Lutheran books on doctrinal theology.

sporadic and temporary, and did not attach themselves to a phenomenon which became a permanent menace in the Church. But the spirit of Antichrist was definitely active, also in the direction which, within a few centuries, attached the entire list of characteristics, as given by Paul and John, to the Roman pontiff as the head and exponent of a system which alone, and in every detail, fits the description of the Antichrist in Holy Scripture.

*In the temple of God, in the midst of the Christian Church, an ecclesiastical hierarchy was developed which, from apostolic times onward, proved to be a virus of tremendous potency. Though the distinction in ministerial rank was at first accepted only *iure humano*, it was urged as existing *iure divino* as early as Ignatius of Antioch and very definitely promulgated by Cyprian of Carthage and others. This teaching paved the way for a centralized, totalitarian government in the Church, which has been one of the strongest factors in the growth and in the authority of the Antichrist, for it practically compelled every member of the Church to place himself under the jurisdiction of the priestly caste in the Church, dependent almost entirely upon the sacrificial activities and the intercessory functions of the incumbents of the holy office and under obligations of absolute obedience to the various members of the system, all under the domination of the one supreme, "divinely instituted" head, the Pope of Rome.*

*In the temple of God, in the midst of the Christian Church, the gradual deposition and dethronement of Christ as the all-sufficient Savior of mankind took place. It is true that, throughout the centuries, we find countless doctrinal expressions and even entire monographs asserting and demonstrating the divinity of the Savior. But all such performances must be discounted or even entirely eliminated by virtue of the fact that the Church of Rome has denied in fact what it taught in theory. We shall take up this matter once more, and in greater detail, at the end of the present discussion. At this point we shall merely insert a quotation from Mauro's *Of the Things Which Must Soon Come to Pass* (p. 107 f.): "In direct opposition to each of these features of revealed truth concerning the 'Son of God,' though the opposition is indeed disguised (so far as possible) with diabolical cleverness, the Romish heresy systematically presents Jesus Christ not as the Son of God, but as the Son of Mary. In all its doctrine, in all its ceremonies, in all its liturgy and books of devotion, in all its pictures and images, and in all its literature, the false Church of Rome, with most consummate and satanic craft, and with most deadly purpose, exalts Mary — making her the compassionate one, the efficacious intercessor on behalf of sinners, the real mediator between God and men, and exhibits Christ in a position of subordination, the effect being, of course,*

that the millions who are thus deluded and blinded by the 'god of this world' are led to put their trust in Mary instead of in Jesus Christ, the *Son of God*. It does not in the least affect the truth of what we are now setting forth that in Romish formularies the words of Scripture are often used, and that Christ is often referred to therein by His Scriptural titles; for all that is but a part, and a most effective part, of the scheme of deception. The devil knows the Scripture, and he knows how to quote it to his own ends; and he knows also how to mix in with the pure meal the deadly poison of his own doctrine. Notwithstanding, therefore, the orthodoxy of creeds and formularies, the maintenance professedly of the doctrine of the Trinity (though truly it is denied in practice) and all that, the Christ of Romanism is 'another Jesus.'” Truly the words of John in his first epistle, chap. 4:3, are fulfilled in the Papacy.

*In the temple of God, in the midst of the Christian Church, the contamination of the Eucharist, of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, was brought about.<sup>2)</sup>* Here again it was a truly diabolical cleverness that succeeded in bringing in the idea of a further necessary sacrifice. It was but natural, almost inevitable, that this first step in the false direction should lead to others, to the blasphemy of transubstantiation, to the adoration of the host, to the withdrawal of the chalice, and in particular to the mass of the Romish Church, that abomination of wickedness which has not only vitiated the Lord's Supper, but has made the entire system of church relationships and church duties one of mere outward performance. Truly, this is one of the great marks of the Antichrist, the subversion and denial of one of the most beautiful and comforting truths of the Gospel.

All this, of course, is associated with the very core and essence of the Antichristian system, for in the temple of God, in the midst of the Christian Church, the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, that of *justification by faith through grace*, was gradually discarded in favor of a blatant work-righteousness that subverts the very foundations of the Gospel. One of the most discouraging chapters in the entire history of dogma is this loss of the great doctrine of Christ and His apostles, namely, that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law. This development was the inevitable consequence of the situation in the Church, especially of its progressive externalization in the matter of its hierachical government, its gradual deposition of Christ as the one Savior of man-

2) See "The Sacrificial Concept in the Eucharist of the Early Church," in the *Theological Quarterly*, October, 1920; "The Eucharist between 30 A.D. and 325 A.D.," in *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, I (1930), 167—183; also "The Corpus Christi Festival and Its Doctrine," in the *Theological Quarterly*, Jan. and April, 1915.

kind, its emphasis upon the second Sacrament as an *opus operatum*, and similar factors.

In the temple of God, in the midst of the Christian Church, other doctrines were gradually promulgated which were, as a matter of fact, in some manner related to those which have already been enumerated. The authority of the Bible as the one infallible source of doctrine and norm of life, was undermined by the acceptance of a translation which bristled with errors and by the insistence upon the "traditions of the Church," including also the decrees of councils as being on a level with the inspired Scriptures. The doctrine of original sin was vitiated by the insistence upon the free will of man, even after the Fall (also of the impeccability of Mary). "Sacraments" were introduced into the Church which lacked the institution of Christ and were, in effect, a further effort to strengthen the power of the Roman hierarchy, to wit, confirmation, marriage, ordination, extreme unction, and penance. The veneration, and eventually the adoration, of the saints was introduced more and more, this movement being associated fundamentally with the prayers for the dead as used in the great liturgies, particularly that of Rome. The doctrine of purgatory was introduced in connection with work-righteousness, and the abomination of indulgences began to flourish. And throughout the centuries the power and authority of the Pope was emphasized more and more. No wonder that pious souls throughout the centuries, and especially after the days of Gregory VII, sighed on account of the deplorable condition of the Church and implored the Lord of the Church for help.

The answer of the Lord came in the days of the Reformation and in particular through the work of Martin Luther. Just how the Lord revealed the unspeakable depravity of the Papacy and brought Luther and his coworkers to the realization that the Pope was in truth the Antichrist has been related so frequently that every student of the Reformation should be familiar with the facts. (See, for example, Fick, *Das Geheimnis der Bosheit*, and some of the monographs referred to above; also, in recent years, Hans Preuss, *Die Vorstellungen vom Antichrist im spaeteren Mittelalter, bei Luther und in der konfessionellen Polemik*, p. 83 ff.) One fact is clear beyond the possibility of controversy, namely, that Luther, by the grace and in the power of the one Lord of the Church, led the stream of the Word of God into this structure, which had been defiled by the doctrines of men, and thus restored the Church of Christ to its pristine and apostolic purity. Thus the Wicked One was revealed, 2 Thess. 2:8; the Antichrist was exposed. But though the Antichrist, in keeping with Rev. 12-14, had received a severe blow, he still did live, Rev. 13:14, for this strong delusion would

be destroyed only with the brightness of the Lord's coming,  
2 Thess. 2:8.

How are we to look upon the events which transpired between the first denunciation of the Papacy as the Antichrist by Wyclif and Huss and especially by Luther and the close of the Council of Trent in 1563? These years are to be regarded in the same way as those during which the Lord gave His chosen people of the Old Testament the final opportunity to embrace the truth of the Savior who had appeared in the person of Jesus Christ, between 27 and 70 A. D. They were times of testing, of searching the hearts. Between the last decades of the fourteenth century and the seventh decade of the sixteenth century, and specifically between 1517 and 1563, the Lord gave all the members of the Church an opportunity to decide for the truth. The alternative before them was: Christ or — Antichrist. The Church of Christ had, of course, been there all the time, hidden, to a large degree, under the filth and debris of the doctrines of the Antichrist, which Luther had now washed away with the limpid stream of God's holy Word. But the Anti-christ and his minions, hardening their hearts against the gracious call of the Lord, just as the Jews of the first century had hardened their hearts against the preaching of the apostles, gathered the filth and the debris which had been swept out of the structure of the Church and therewith built up a denomination of their own.

The Roman Catholic Church, more properly called the Romish sect, the Church of the Antichrist, had its inception with the Council of Trent, and should be so dated in all sound books of church history. For the decrees of this sect clearly indicate that the tenets which were accepted and promulgated under the jurisdiction of the Papacy have now been received as the official doctrines of this new denomination. We offer only a few samples of doctrines, taken from the *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (ed. by J. Waterworth):

*On the Sacred Books of the Church.* — "If any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate version, and knowingly and deliberately contemn the traditions aforesaid: let him be anathema. . . . Moreover, the same sacred and holy Synod, — considering that no small utility may accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known which out of all the Latin editions, now in circulation, of the sacred books, is to be held as authentic, — ordains and declares that the said old and Vulgate edition, which, by the lengthened usage of so many years, has been approved of in the Church, be, in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and exposi-

tions, *held as authentic*; and that no one is to dare, or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever." (P. 19.)

*On Justification.* — "Canon IX. If any one saith that by faith alone the impious is justified, in such wise as to mean that nothing else is required to cooperate in order to the obtaining the grace of justification, and that it is not in any way necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will: let him be anathema." (P. 45.)

"Canon XXI. If any one saith that Christ Jesus was given of God to men as a Redeemer in whom to trust, and not also as a legislator whom to obey: let him be anathema." (P. 47.)

*On the Sacraments.* — "If any one saith that by the said sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed (*ex opere operato*), but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace: let him be anathema." (P. 55.)

*On Transubstantiation.* — "And because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which He offered under the species of the bread to be truly His own body, therefore it has ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made (*conversionem fieri*) of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, suitable and properly called transubstantiation." (P. 78.)

*On the Eucharist.* — "Canon IX. If any one saith that, after the consecration is completed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but (are there) only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after, and that, in the host, or consecrated particles, which are reserved or which remain after Communion the true body of the Lord remaineth not: let him be anathema."

"Canon VI. If any one saith that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external of latria; and is, consequently, neither to be venerated with a special festive solemnity, nor to be borne about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of the holy Church, or is not to be proposed (*propoendum*) publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters: let him be anathema." (P. 83.)

We could continue to quote from this compendium of blasphemy for pages upon pages, particularly also from the section entitled "On the Sacrifice of the Mass," "On the Invocation of

Saints," etc., but space will not permit. Every Lutheran theologian is familiar with the fact that Martin Chemnitz, in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, has so completely demolished the papal, that is, the antichristian declarations, resolutions, and decrees of the Romish sect that the veriest tyro in the field of sound theology must admit that the Antichrist, the papal system with its visible head, the Pope of Rome, have been fully exposed on the basis of the soundest Biblical arguments and proofs.

But the objection has been raised that there have been further manifestations in the papal system since the Reformation, and that, since other antichristian phenomena may still come, therefore our argument as to the identification of the Antichrist is weakened. But the very opposite is true. If men were not yet satisfied with the manner in which the Antichrist was exposed during the period of the Reformation, the Lord, as it were, brought further evidence of the unspeakable corruption of the Papacy. Thus it was a well-known fact, which had actually been utilized by the papal system for centuries, that the Pope was to be regarded as the infallible teacher of the Church and of the universe. This tenet of the infallibility of the Pope, when speaking *ex cathedra*, was made a dogma of the Romish sect by the Vatican Council of 1870, thereby affording another bit of evidence that the Pope is truly the Antichrist, who "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped, so that he as god sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2: 4.

And the end is not yet. We stated above that the antichristian forces of the Church, even in the early centuries, had begun the movement to dethrone Christ and that the Mariolatry as practised in the Romish sect is a proof for its virtual rejection of the Savior. That there is a systematic movement on foot to carry the blasphemy of Mariolatry to the last extreme is shown by recent developments regarding the tenet of the so-called "assumption of Mary." This teaching or tenet, found in the Church since the sixth century, is not yet a dogma of the Church, but is practically so regarded by the leaders of Antichrist, and it seems to be only a question of time before it will be so promulgated. Cabrol, in his *The Year's Liturgy* (Vol. II, p. 40), says concerning the assumption of Mary: "This belief is by no means a defined dogma of faith, but it is so firmly rooted in Christian piety that it would be temerarious to deny it." And in an article in *America*, of August 9, 1941, we find the statement: "It is not yet a defined article of faith; yet it has been held dearly through many centuries and seems clearly included among the prerogatives which God conferred on His blessed Mother. It is very probable that our own century will see this doctrine raised to the dignity of an article of faith. If so, we

shall then complete the tale of the end of Mary's days with as beautiful a doctrine as that which touches her beginnings in immaculate conception."

What shall we say to these things? Are we merely dealing with a strange conceit of the Papacy, with an innocuous delusion? We offer at this time just three bits of evidence as to whether this trend will lead, namely, to the final deposition and dethronement of our blessed Savior, so that the Antichrist will have removed the Savior entirely from His place in the plan of redemption and placed a creature in His stead.

Exhibit No. 1 is taken from Kearney, *The Meaning of the Mass* (3d enlarged edition, 1940, Chapter VII, "In Union with Mary," p. 167 ff.):

Our union with the Holy Sacrifice therefore must be through Mary and with Mary, *through* her assistance and in union *with* her total abandonment to the Divine Majesty. Without her motherly help we can never hope to overcome our inordinate self-seeking so as to give ourselves to God without reserve in union with Jesus, making the divine will our sole guide in all we do. But through her assistance we can confidently expect, in spite of our weakness, a real advance in the conformity of our will to God's will, a rapid advance in the perfection of our surrender to God in union with the surrender of our Lord.

Exhibit No. 2 is taken from a booklet which is generally distributed among members of the Roman Catholic Church. It is called *Communion Devotions in Union with Mary*, and its sixth edition numbered 140,000 copies. We quote just a few of the prayers found in this booklet:

#### At the Gradual

Blessed and honored be thou, O Virgin Mary, who in virginal purity didst become the Mother of the Savior.

V. O Blessed Virgin and Mother of God, thou didst bear in thy womb Him whom the heavens cannot contain.

R. After childbirth, O Virgin, thou didst remain inviolate. O Mother of God, plead for us.

#### At the Canon

Most holy Virgin, now, in this supreme moment, when the heavens are about to open and thy Divine Son to descend upon this altar, remember that I am wholly thine, remember to make intercession for me. I confide to thee, now and always, my body and my soul, all my toils and labors, all my joys and sorrows, all my prayers and good works. Do thou thyself present all my necessities and the desires of my heart to thy Divine Son.

I also place under thy maternal protection, my parents, relatives, benefactors, friends, and enemies. Pray, O Blessed Mother, for the Holy Church, for our Holy Father, the Pope, for all the bishops, priests, and religious. Pray for the rising generation, for sinners, infidels, heretics, for the oppressed, the tempted, the sick and dying. I beseech thee, by thy Immaculate Heart, which I venerate and love so dearly, obtain for me the grace of participating in all the merits of this Holy Sacrifice.

### At Holy Communion

. . . O Mary, my dearest Mother, at this important moment I confidently turn to thee. Holiest Mother, I pray thee, lend me thy Heart, thy Heart so beautiful, so pure and immaculate, thy Heart full of love and humility, that I may be able to receive Jesus with the same sentiments with which thou didst receive Him. Come, O Mary, thyself to me, and receive Jesus in me. Thou canst do so, O loving Mother, on account of the dominion thou dost exercise over all hearts.

O Jesus, true Son of God, I believe in Thee! O Jesus, my only Refuge, I hope in Thee! O Jesus, my sovereign Good, I love Thee! And because I love Thee, I am sorry that I have offended Thee.

(If you cannot receive sacramentally, make an act of desire to receive spiritually)

O Jesus, who on account of Thy special love for Mary dost still long to take Thy delight and rest in her, and dost desire to take this rest even in my soul, which is poorer and more wretched than was the stable of Bethlehem — behold, in humility and love I lead Thee into the Heart of Mary and present Thee to Thy Mother.

O my dearest Mother, I give thee the most noble of gifts, the same that the Heavenly Father presented to thee. With filial love I place Jesus in thy maternal arms, in thy virginal bosom, and enclose Him with greatest reverence in thy sweetest Heart.

O Mother most admirable, adore Him, love Him, thank Him for me and in my name. I ask for nothing else than to belong wholly to thee and to Christ now and forever.

### After Holy Communion

O holiest Virgin and Mother of God, I beseech thee, obtain for me the great grace to receive the Most Holy Sacrament at the end of my life; that in the true faith and in union with Jesus Christ, I may happily yield my spirit, and be found worthy to behold God in His glory, to love and possess Him eternally. . . .

### Prayer to Mary to Obtain Love, Humility, and Purity

. . . O heavenly Virgin, Queen of my heart, at this moment I renew from the depths of my soul the perfect consecration which I have made to thee, of all that I am and have. I belong to thee entirely, but thou also dost belong to me. Jesus, thy Son, whom I shall receive, has given thee to me as my Mother, and I have chosen thee for my Mother and Mistress. I am now about to become the sanctuary of Jesus: but what a poor dwelling I offer to the King of heaven! Ah, I dare not open to Him the door of my heart, so sinful, cold and tepid. Thou, O good Mother, must receive Him in me and be to Him a dwelling-place. He finds His pleasure and delight wherever thou art; even the stable of Bethlehem was delightful to Him because of thy presence. Then He will also be pleased to take up His abode in my soul, if He finds His dear Mother there.

Come, therefore, dearest Mother; give me thy pure, love-glowing Heart in place of mine, so cold and guilty. Adorn me with thy virtues and merits, and Jesus will find in my soul the perfect preparation which thy soul offered Him at the moment of His incarnation, and which He found there also after His ascension, when thou didst receive Him in Holy Communion. Jesus will rest with delight amidst the lilies of thy virginal purity! He will be honored and glorified by thy profound adoration, by thy sublime praises! What happiness for me, thy child! I can give thee Jesus, the same gift the Eternal Father gave thee on the day of the incarnation.

I offer to thee, O my merciful Mother, the King of angels and of men. Through Jesus and in Him I am enabled to honor, love and thank thee worthily for the many graces and mercies thou hast shown

me during life. Lend me thy Heart, then, O Mary; help me to love my God. O my Blessed Mother, remember, it is Jesus whom I am about to receive; assist me to prepare my poor heart for His reception.

Exhibit No. 3, the most comprehensive of all, is taken from the "Ecclesiastical Review" of May, 1941. It is entitled *The Relation of the Eucharist to the Blessed Virgin*, its author being His Excellency, Monsignor Ernesto Ruffini, Rome, Italy:

Solemn Holy Hour of Adoration held in the Church of St. Mary Major of Rome, on the occasion of the Third National Italian Congress of Priest Adorers, April 27, 1939

#### FIRST QUARTER HOUR

##### ADORATION

##### **Jesus is Present**

1. Jesus is present in the Holy Eucharist, truly, really, substantially, Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity.

He had promised this presence in the celebrated discourses He pronounced in the Synagog of Capharnaum immediately after the first multiplication of the loaves, and His walking upon the waters of Tiberias: *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. . . . For My flesh is meat indeed: and My blood is drink indeed. . . . As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me. This is the bread that came down from heaven* (John 6:51, 56, 58).

The promise was fulfilled at the last supper, in the Cenacle: *Take ye and eat, this is My Body. . . . Take and drink ye all of this, this is the chalice of My blood.*

By virtue of these words, which are words of consecration, and by natural concomitance, Jesus Christ is entirely present under both species.

This is confirmed by the great Apostle Paul in the first letter to the Corinthians (written about the year 57). *The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? . . . Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord* (1 Cor. 10:16; 11:27).

This is a great mystery, *Mysterium Fidei*, which has its origin in the impenetrable obscurities of substance and which is lost in the infinite power of God.

##### **Jesus is True God**

2. Jesus was called "My beloved Son" by the Father, and He Himself declared that He was the only-begotten Son of the Father (John 3:16-18; 9:35-38; 10:30; Matt. 26:63 etc.), proving His assertion by His life, His miracles, His prophecies; and this truth is ratified by the firmest conviction, nineteen centuries of the faith of our Holy Church.

The Eucharist itself bears the countersign of the divinity; what indeed is more humble than the Eucharistic bread? And yet there is nothing more glorious. To realize this, just think of the solemn ceremonial celebrated around our altars, of the majestic national and international Eucharistic Congresses. The innumerable Catholic Churches scattered over the world with the treasures contained in them, what are they but little dwelling places of the Eucharist?

What is more fragile than a host? And yet no force is comparable to the consecrated Host. Stainless purity in the midst of corruption, martyrdom sustained with the greatest heroism by weak human beings,

the most disinterested and sacrificing apostolate for the salvation of souls, these are fruits of the Eucharist.

The Eucharist is the very center of our holy Religion, all the marvelous life and story of the Church has its support and its explanation in the Eucharist.

3. By our belief in the Holy Eucharist, we profess the dogma of the Holy Trinity, of the Incarnation, and consequently, of Original Sin, and of the Supernatural Order, the dogma of the resurrection of the body (*I will raise him up on the last day: John 6:40, 44, 55*) and of eternal life (*If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: John 6:52*).

Let us then renew our Faith which has an august compendium in the Eucharist.

### Holy Mary

We cannot honor the Holy Eucharist without honoring Mary.

1. Jesus present in the Eucharist is the son of Mary.

"Hail true Body, of Mary, Virgin Born" we sing in the *Ave Verum*.

"Sing, O my tongue, the mystery of the glorious body, and of the precious blood, which the King of the Gentiles, *the fruit of a noble womb — shed for the redemption of the world.*" This we sing in the *Pange Lingua*.

The relation of Mother and Son also remains in the Holy Eucharist.

2. Jesus in the Sacrament of the Altar reveals himself as true God; hence Mary is true mother of the Eucharistic God and the triumph of the divinity of Jesus in the consecrated Host is also the triumph of the divine Maternity of Mary. Very fitting it is indeed that this hour of adoration is being held in this stately temple of the Queen of Heaven, wherein fifteen hundred years ago, Pope Sixtus III, realized the design of perpetuating in a splendid mosaic over the main altar the dogma which is the root of all the greatness of Mary.

3. Like the Eucharist, too, the Blessed Virgin is a compendium of our Religion; for in her there seem to be united the most sublime truths of our holy Faith.

Devotion to Mary nourishes our devotion to the Holy Eucharist.

1. Mary is humble, pure, obedient even to the sacrifice of herself, as is revealed in her reply to the Archangel Gabriel; and the Eucharist is the example and the source of these her beloved virtues; so too, she leads to the Eucharist those souls devoted to her.

2. She loves Jesus, and this intense love is the measure of her zeal to make Him loved, there especially where He is present.

3. This is why the Eucharist and the Blessed Virgin have had the same lot throughout the centuries: Protestants denied the dogma of Transubstantiation and at the same time refused any cult or honor of the Virgin Mother; the so-called orthodox Church maintained the cult of the Blessed Virgin and has also conserved the Blessed Sacrament.

At Lourdes, the most famous shrine of the Blessed Mother, in our times, the glory of the Holy Eucharist and the visible honoring of the Blessed Sacrament is unsurpassed.

Let us kneel, dear Brothers, in the most profound adoration, as we make our own the sentiments of the Holy Magi, when after their long journey and difficult quest, *invenerunt Jesum cum Maria matre eius* (Matt. 2:11).

### SECOND QUARTER HOUR

#### THANKSGIVING

#### Jesus in the Holy Eucharist

1. Is the faithful friend. Everyone else, sooner or later, leaves us, and frequently when our days are especially filled with sadness, when we have the greatest need for comfort, we feel alone; but Jesus never

quits us: *I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world* (Matt. 28:20).

2. Is the food of our souls, which sustains us in the wearisome pilgrimage through this valley of tears and consoles us in the desert of this mortal life. *The Bread of Life . . . the Bread which cometh down from heaven; that if any man eat of it, he may not die* (John 6:35-50).

3. Is the Victim for our sins: *Corpus quod pro vobis datur*, viz., that is sacrificed for us; *Sanguis qui pro multis effunditur in remissionem peccatorum.*\* So ardent was the desire of the Divine Master to die for us that He exhausted all His power, all His wisdom, and the treasures of His riches so that He might be immolated continually upon our altars.

### Mary Most Holy

Has contributed greatly to this ineffable gift.

1. The Virgin Mother ministered to Jesus, the Flesh and the Blood which we adore and receive in the Divine Eucharist.

2. The Eucharist is the extension in time and in space of the Incarnation. Now, the Blessed Virgin, with her spotless virtues and her ardent prayers, merited, *de congruo*, as the theologians say, that the Son of God assume human flesh.

3. Almighty God sought the consent of the Immaculate Virgin for the incarnation of the Divine Word, and the acceptance of Mary was, in the Eternal Plan necessary for the new Alliance (*Testamentum, Foedus*), which of its nature supposes a bilateral act. God besought: Mary, most pure, most holy, accepted in the name of the human race. It is worthy of particular emphasis to note that the blessed Jesus spoke of the new Pact at the last Supper and in the strictest relationship with the Holy Eucharist: He said, in fact, of the Blood contained in the Chalice that it is "the Blood of the New Testament": *Hic est Sanguis Novi Testamenti* (Matt. 16:28; Mark 14:24), and still more clearly, according to Saint Luke (22:20) and Saint Paul (1 Cor. 11:25), that the Eucharistic Chalice is the New Testament in His Blood: *Hic Calix Novum Testamentum est in meo Sanguine*. Mary therefore having an essential part in the new Alliance, also has a necessary part in Holy Eucharist.

4. Mary is the mother of the Divine Savior; it was by this title that the Angel announced the birth of Jesus to the shepherds: *This day is born to you a Savior* (Luke 2:11). Moreover, the Son of God was born of Mary not only with a physical body, but also with a mystic body made of those he would save: *So we being many, are one body in Christ* (Rom. 12:5); *Because we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones* (Eph. 5:30); hence since we are all found in Christ Jesus, we are all born of Mary. But how could the most holy Virgin be our Mother in the sense that Jesus dying on the Cross assigned her to us if she did not contribute effectively to give us supernatural life? For this is the very object of the Incarnation: *I am come that they may have life and may have it more abundantly* (John 10:10). Moreover, the same Jesus proclaims that the sole source of life is His Flesh and His Blood: *Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you* (John 6:54).

We can do nothing less than to recognize that Mary has a great share in this ineffable gift of the Holy Eucharist.

Eve in the terrestrial Paradise carried to Adam the food of death; our first parent said this when God began his terrible investigation in the earthly Paradise, an instant after the fault: *The woman thou gavest me, gave me of the fruit and I did eat* (Gen. 3:12); he might have added: *And I am dead!*

---

\* This is the reading of the Greek text according to all the Synoptics (Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20).

Mary, the new Eve, offers us a food, too, the most Holy Eucharist, which is the food of life.

Venerable brethren, let there rise from our grateful, throbbing heart a hymn of thanksgiving to Jesus and to Mary.

### THIRD QUARTER HOUR

#### EXPIATION

1. The Holy Eucharist is a true sacrifice, therefore reparation of our faults; we discern this:

—from the prophecy of Malachias: *From the rising to the going down of the sun, My name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrificed and offered to My name a clean oblation* (Mal. 1:11);

—from the words of institution: *This is My Body, which is given for you* (Luke 22:19); *For this is My blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins* (Matt. 26:28);

—from the teaching of the Apostle Paul, who in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (10:15, 22) opposes the Holy Eucharist to the Jewish and pagan Sacrifices.

The Catholic tradition is a luminous confirmation of this truth.

2. The Eucharistic Sacrifice is identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross; there is the same Priest, the same Victim, the same object; there are the same fruits; the merits gained by Jesus dying on the Cross are distributed to souls by Jesus sacrificed in the Eucharist; the manner alone is different, bloody on the Cross, unbloody in the Sacrament of the Altar.

### Holy Mary Is Our Co-Redemptrix

We have redemption through His blood (Ephesians 1:7) that is, principally through the passion and death of Jesus Christ: The Blessed Virgin is associated with Jesus in the great work of the human Redemption, and, by reason of this and above all, in His Sacrifice and death. In fact:

1. Mary is the new Eve, the consoling Aurora, that foretells the Sun of Justice immediately after the fall of our first Parents: *I will place enmities between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed: She shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel* (Gen. 3:15). The very uncertainty of the Latin text "Ipsum," "Ipsa," tends to demonstrate the intimate union, in the victorious battle against the powers of Hell, existing between the Son and the Mother, who constitute one moral person.

The Apostle of the Gentiles in his letter to the Romans (5:14), and in the first letter to the Corinthians (15:22, 45) when he calls Adam "a figure of him who was to come" and Jesus Christ "the last Adam" makes clear allusions to the new Eve, whose name we seek as it were between the lines, while we read the two Epistles.

2. The Archangel Gabriel, in the Annunciation describes Him who is to be born of Mary in Messianic terms. The Blessed Virgin, then, with the words *Ecce Ancilla Domini, fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum* (Luke 1:38) accepts the charge of becoming the mother of the patient Messias foretold by the Prophets and especially by Isaiah (62:13; 63:12); in consequence she participates in the passion and death of Jesus, becoming the "Queen of Martyrs."

3. The Prophet Simeon, upon the day of the Purification, connects most closely the sorrows of Mary with the Passion of the Redeemer:

*A sign which shall be contradicted . . . and thy own soul a sword shall pierce*" (Luke 2:34).

4. The Blessed Virgin acts in the sacrifice of the Cross: *remotely* by administering the matter of the sacrifice itself, by nourishing and guarding it; *proximately* by offering together with Christ, the High Priest, the very same host; she also in addition shares the same pains, dying within her heart, while Jesus is dying crucified:

*Stabat Mater dolorosa  
Juxta Crucem lacrymosa  
Dum pendebat Filius.*

5. Likewise in Heaven, according to John's vision in ecstasy, while the "divine Lamb" is "as one dead" (Apoc. 5:6), Mary, surrounded by the sun, with the moon at her feet, girded with twelve stars, continues to experience mystically the sorrows of giving birth, by her active co-operation in the salvation of souls: *AND BEING WITH CHILD, SHE CRIED TRAVAILING IN BIRTH, AND WAS IN PAIN TO BE DELIVERED* (Apoc. 12:2).

Now, with the Sacrifice of the Cross being perpetuated in the Holy Eucharist, we must admit that Mary continues in the Sacrifice of the Altar the office she accomplished with Jesus, through the redemption of men, on Calvary.

As we ask pardon, dear brethren, of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, we ought ask pardon, too, of Mary: *Parce, Domine, parce, Domina, populo tuo!* Mercy, O Lord, mercy, Lady, for our sins!

#### FOURTH QUARTER HOUR

##### IMPETRATION

The Eucharist, as a Sacrament which contains the very Author of grace, is for everyone the font and source of every gift: . . . *omnium fons et caput bonorum est potissimum Augusta Eucharistia.*<sup>†</sup> The Sacrament of Sacraments, and end of all the Sacraments, the Holy Eucharist is nothing else, according to the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, than the application of the Passion of the Lord to us.

##### Mary Most Holy

##### Is the Mediatrix and Dispensatrix of every Grace

The work of the Redemption and of our salvation results, so to speak, from two acts or two stages, the acquisition of graces and their distribution: Mary, as Co-redemptrix, has a share in the first; it follows that she was to have a share in the second.

It is evident that Jesus Christ is the principal Mediator, perfect, sufficient, absolutely necessary, and by His own merits; but this does not exclude the participation of Mary, in so far as *dispositive*, as Theologians express it, and *ministerialiter*, dependent on Christ, she concurs with Him to aid us to reach Heaven.

In her office as Mother of God, she is intimately joined with Jesus Christ, the Redeemer: she can do everything;

In her capacity of Mother of Men, in the Beatific Vision, she knows all our necessities;

And with that immense charity with which she is endowed, she wants to help us in everything.

For this reason, in the writings of the Fathers and the Theologians, she has taken the name of Aqueduct of grace and of Link of that mystic Body whose head is the Savior, from whom there flow into the members, through the Blessed Virgin as channel, all the fruits of the Redemption.

---

<sup>†</sup> Leo XIII, *Encycl. Mirae Cantatis*, May 28, 1902.

It is therefore proper to exclaim: *Of His fullness, THROUGH MARY, we have all received* (cf. John 1:16). And this supernatural law may be said to be revealed in concrete manner in the Holy Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles:

1. John the Baptist is sanctified, before his birth, by means of Mary (Luke 1:15, 41, 44).

2. At Cana of Galilee Jesus hastened the hour of His mercies through the intercession of Mary; and in virtue of that miracle, the first disciples believed in Him: *This first of miracles wrought Jesus in Cana of Galilee: and He manifested His glory and His disciples believed in Him* (John 2:11).

3. John the Evangelist, after having fled in the Garden of Olives with the other Apostles: *All leaving Him, fled* (Matt. 26:56), regains courage and perseveres in following Jesus amidst the insults of Calvary, because he was accompanied by Mary: *When Jesus therefore saw His mother and the disciple standing whom He loved, He said to the Mother: Woman, behold thy Son. Then He said to the disciple: Behold thy Mother. And from that hour, the disciple took her to be his own* (John 19:26).

4. The Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, which marks the inauguration of holy Church, takes place while the Apostles and the Disciples are *persevering with one mind* in prayer with Mary the Mother of Jesus (Acts 1:14).

In these facts, there is the beginning of every grace through the mediation of the Blessed Virgin, both in the spiritual and in the material order; through Mary are granted the three principal graces of the work of salvation; vocation, justification, perseverance. Now God, who never changes what He has willed to do, after decreeing that we should have everything through Mary (*Qui bona omnia nos habere voluit per Mariam*), certainly requires the intervention of the Virgin Mary that graces come to our souls from the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus.

Blessed Virgin, dispensatrix of grace, in the first place of the divine Eucharist, source of every gift, *monstra te esse Matrem* by making us ever less unworthy of being sharers of the Priesthood of Jesus, Thy Son. Assist us in the celebration of holy Mass, in the distribution of Holy Communion, and make our devotion to Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament all that you desire. Hear us, Mother of God and our Mother, while with the noble Apostle of the Eucharist, Blessed Peter Julian Eymard, we turn prayerfully to thee,

*Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament.*

### Conclusion

The evidence presented in this article, brief as it is, seems to us to be of a nature that "he who runs may read." And therefore we conclude with a quotation from Walther's *The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel* (translated by W. H. T. Dau): "True, quite a number, in fact, the majority of those who claim to be Lutherans refuse to believe that the Pope is the Antichrist and the Papacy the antichristian power. With the entire Church of the Reformation and in accord with the confessions of this Church the orthodox American Lutheran Church of our time still in full earnest maintains the position that the Pope is the Antichrist. But that is, at best, regarded as the odd fancy of narrow-minded men, who refuse to keep step with the times. If you ask why this is so, I answer that it is chiefly because people no longer know what

constitutes the Antichrist and the antichristian dominion. People say: 'We admit that, especially in the Middle Ages, there were many Popes who were veritable abominations and, even in the view of Romish writers, were swallowed up by hell.' It is admitted that many shocking abominations are still practiced by the Papacy, but this is offset by the reminder that there is not a Church free from errors and even from Judases. It is furthermore admitted that the Papacy is propagating the most horrible heresies, but over against this the fact is stressed that even the Papacy holds strictly to the three Ecumenical Creeds. For at the opening session and solemn organization of the Council of Trent, in 1545, those three creeds were recited. Our attention is also called to the fact that the Popes believe the Bible of the Old and the New Testament to be the revealed Word of God, God to be triune, and Christ to be God and man in one person and the Savior of the World. We are told: 'The Papists confess, just as we do, their faith in a future resurrection of the dead, a last Judgment, before which all men will be cited, and a heaven and a hell. Far, then, from being the dominion of Antichrist,' these people say, 'the Papacy is rather a powerful dam shutting out the fearful deluge of unbelief that has come down on the Christian Church.' People see the rule of Antichrist in pantheism, materialism, atheism, socialism, nihilism, anarchism, and other horrible isms to which the modern age has fallen heir. But why is it that from the aforementioned premises men will draw the conclusion that the Papacy is not the rule of Antichrist and the Pope not the veritable Antichrist? The chief reason is that people fail to consider what it means when the Pope claims to be the vicegerent of Christ on earth and the visible head of the entire Christian Church. In order to be this, he must, of course, profess many Christian doctrines. He has to put on a mask, otherwise Antichrist could not possibly exist in the midst of the Christian Church. Moreover, he has to declare war against the enemies of all religions and against the enemies of the Christian religion to support his claim of being the vicegerent of Christ. He knows that, when Christ falls, Antichrist, too, must fall. For when He falls whose vicegerent the Pope claims to be, there is an end of vicegerency. When the Pope apparently fights for Christ and the Christian Church, he fights for himself and his dominion." (Pp. 67, 68.)  
*Ceterum censeo: Papam esse verum Antichristum.*

P. E. KRETMANN

---

## Outlines on the Wuerttemberg Epistle Selections

### Septuagesima

Acts 9:36-42

Sooner or later an unwelcome visitor will come into your home: It will be death. You may stave off this visit for a time, but it will come, and it will turn your happy home into a house of mourning. We dread to think of this unwelcome visit, but we should be prepared for its coming.

#### A Christian's Conduct When Death Comes to His Home

1. *He mourns over his loss*
2. *He seeks comfort in God's Word*
3. *He speaks well of the departed*
4. *He looks forward to a blissful resurrection*

### 1

Our body is "wonderfully made," Ps. 139:14; God created man's body with great care and lavishes His love upon it; the whole earth must provide sustenance for it, Joel 2:23, 24; God guards it, Luke 12:7. But when death, the result of sin, comes, the body decays and must be buried. When we must attend to this sad duty, our hearts are filled with grief, we weep and lament. This is quite proper; there was mourning when Tabitha died, v. 39; Acts 8:2; 2 Sam. 3:31. But Christians must not mourn "as others which have no hope," 1 Thess. 4:13. Our mourning must be tempered with hope and assurance that death is a victory, 1 Cor. 15:54-57, and the entrance into eternal life for those who die in faith in Christ. When we stand beside the coffin of a believer, we know that Jesus has said: Luke 23:43.—There is something else that should be said. With grieving hearts we must lay our departed loved one into the grave. The Bible says little about funerals, but it does suggest sincere simplicity, v. 37; John 19:42. There should be no extravagant display at a Christian funeral, merely to "show off." A rich man should not be buried in a pine box, and a poor man should not be buried with costly splendor. Much money is spent at funerals that could be used for better purposes.

### 2

Christians seek comfort in God's Word, v. 38. Peter was their pastor and teacher; they knew he would bring them solace from God's Word. They sought this comfort sincerely and eagerly; Peter should come without delay. So Christians seek comfort from God's Word when death visits their home. They do not despair in

sorrow nor accuse God of cruel injustice in taking away their loved ones; they bow in submission to God's will. They recall Bible-verses that they know, Job 1:21; Ps. 23:4; and hymn-verses, No. 540; they call their pastor, v. 38, who will comfort them with beautiful words from the Scriptures. It is a wonderful thing to receive such comfort, and many a mourning Christian has said: "What would have become of me if I had not had God's Word to sustain me in my grief."

## 3

Christians speak well of their departed loved ones, vv. 36, 39. We can hear them speaking: "Tabitha was a Christian woman, a true believer; she loved her Savior because He had redeemed her; she put her trust in Jesus; and see how she showed her faith by deeds of love, how she made garments for the poor, how she helped those who were in need." So we should say good things of the dead; we should speak of their faith, their love for God's Word, their repentance, and their good works as the fruit of faith. One can do that only for a believer. Often people give high praise to the deeds of a person who was not a Christian; sometimes a pastor is expected to do this in a funeral sermon; but we must keep in mind what the Savior says, John 15:5, 6. Christians are thankful to God when they can say of their departed loved ones that they lived and died in faith in Christ and proved their faith by a pious life, Hymn 538, 4.

## 4

When Christians mourn over a death in the family, they look forward to a blissful resurrection and reunion in heaven. The people in our text had been taught these doctrines, and they believed them (v. 41, they were saints, believers). And now they see the fulfilment of their faith long before they could expect it, vv. 40, 41.—We know that there will be a resurrection, John 5:28, 29; Job 19:25-27. When Christians carry one of their loved ones to the grave, they cling to the hope that the body will rise again in glory on the Last Day, John 6:40; 2 Cor. 4:14. How empty would our Christian faith be without this hope! 1 Cor. 15:16-18. Christians hope for a blessed reunion in heaven; the disciples of Jesus, in the hour of His transfiguration, when they saw a glimpse of heaven, knew Moses and Elias, Matt. 17:3, 4 (Pieper, *Dogmatics*, p. 620); and Christians express this beautiful hope in the prayer spoken in church after the announcement of the death of a member of the congregation, "We pray Thee, comfort the survivors with Thine everlasting comfort, and cheer them with the sweet hope of a blessed reunion in heaven."

That is true Christian conduct when death comes to our homes. If we will learn these four lessons now, we shall be able to use them when the unwelcome visitor knocks at our door and enters. We will be prepared. We shall be able to stand before the coffin of a loved one, with breaking hearts and tearful eyes, but we shall be able to say: Hymn 547:1, 4. FREDERIC NIEDNER

---

### Sexagesima

Heb. 10:19-25

This text prepares us for the Lenten season soon to begin. It exhorts us to consider the Great High Priest provided for us by God and to remain ever loyal to Him.

#### Let Us Remain Loyal to Our Great High Priest

1. *Let us come to Him boldly at all times*
2. *Let us hold fast the profession of our faith*
3. *Let us rouse our brethren to like loyalty*

### 1

V. 19. We have boldness to enter into the holiest. We can have absolute confidence in the way leading into the presence of God Himself. If ever we need a reconciled God to be our Guide through life, we need Him in these days of unrest and worry. Here is the absolutely reliable way to this reconciled Father. It is the way by the blood of Jesus, v. 19, through the veil of His flesh, v. 20, a way opened by His deep humiliation unto the death of the cross, Phil. 2:5-8, by the shedding of His divine blood, 1 John 1:7. Ought we not to have confidence in this way?

It is a new way, such as only Christ could consecrate. Because He Himself is this way, it is a living way, v. 20, a way which transports us to God without any effort on our part, as, e.g., a moving sidewalk or an escalator. Ought we not gladly make use of this Way? Instead of complaining, worrying, ought we not permit Christ to lead us straight to our heavenly Father?

Our High Priest Himself has placed us on this way by Word and Sacrament. He has sprinkled our hearts and washed our bodies, v. 22, cleansed soul and body from all sins. We are through Him fit to appear before the Holy God. Let us draw near with a true heart. Let us not contaminate ourselves with sin and doubt, but through the use of Word and Sacrament be strengthened in that full assurance of faith which at all times goes straight to our Father and tells Him all our joys and sorrows, stands in daily and intimate communion with Him.

## 2

V. 23. Only by professing Christ can we retain Him and His blessings; cf. Matt. 10:32, 33. Our High Priest surely is worthy of our loyal confession. We profess a High Priest far excelling even Aaron and the whole tribe of Levitical priests, ch. 5:1-6; 7:5-17, a great Priest over the house of God, His Church on earth and in heaven, Heb. 12:22-24; who loves His Church and sympathizes with every one of its members, ch. 2:14-18; 4:15; 5:1, 2. We have a High Priest who not only has redeemed us from past sins, who not only daily cleanses, teaches, comforts us, who also engenders in our heart a living hope by His promise of that eternal life which He has procured for us through His suffering and death, cf. 3:14 to 4:11; 6:9-20; 9:28. This hope will not make us ashamed, for He is faithful that promised, v. 23b. Ought we ever to be ashamed of confessing so great a High Priest? Alas, how often has our mouth been silent! How often have our actions denied Him who is the author of our temporal and eternal salvation. Let us in the Lenten season gather round about the cross of Christ and there obtain strength and willingness for loyal profession of His name.

## 3

Vv. 24, 25. As loyal servants of our High Priest we must provoke, stimulate our fellow-Christians unto love and to good works, so that together with us they may serve their High Priest in true righteousness and holiness. Micah 6:8; Rom. 13:10; Phil. 4:8, 9; Col. 3:10 to 4:6.

For this purpose let us be diligent in attending public worship, v. 25. There in the public assembly we are built up on our most holy faith and are thus enabled to teach and exhort our brethren to remain unwaveringly faithful to their Savior. By our own example we influence others not to forsake public worship but with us to come to that place where our great High Priest offers to us in Word and Sacrament the blessings He procured for us by His suffering and death. Wherever we have opportunity, let us admonish, instruct, and comfort our brethren so that in unity of faith and loyalty to the Son of God we may walk with them on the living way prepared for us by our great High Priest.

This we should do so much the more as we see the day approaching, that Great Day on which we must all appear before the judgment throne of Christ, 2 Cor. 5:10, that blessed day when Christ Himself will appear without sin unto salvation to all that believe on Him. Heb. 9:28.

TH. LAETSCH

**Quinquagesima Sunday****2 Cor. 11:23-30**

In speaking of his services as an apostle of Christ, Paul presents himself as a shining example to all pastors. These words, however, may be applied to all Christians. They set up a high ideal that every member of a Christian congregation should endeavor to attain. From this viewpoint let us study our text.

**Paul an Example of Loyal Christian Service**

1. *In his sufferings for Christ's sake.*
2. *In his care for his fellow-Christians*
3. *In his boasting of his weakness*

**1**

V. 23. The false apostles, v. 13 ff., professed to be Christ's ministers, servants, while they sought their own honor and comfort, vv. 19, 20. Paul lays claim to this title in a far nobler sense, the only true sense. He is a servant ever ready to do Christ's command, always willing to endure any hardship for His name's sake. Cp. Acts 9:15, 16. What a long list of sufferings vv. 23-27! Picture them briefly, vividly. And all for Christ's sake. Paul might have avoided all these hardships by leaving the service of his Master. But that would have been disloyalty to his Savior, to whom he owed so much, Gal. 2:20; 1 Tim. 1:15; etc. Loyally, faithfully, he served in the sufferings appointed for him.

The Savior demands like willingness to suffer for His name's sake of all His followers. Matt. 10:34-39; Acts 14:22; 1 Pet. 4:12-19; etc. Are we as willing as Paul to suffer mockery, ridicule, persecution, loss of business, of prestige, of social standing for the sake of Him who died for us to make us His own in time and eternity? Is not our motto only too often, Safety first? What have we given up for Christ? What do you do for your congregation? your Church? How often do we refuse our cooperation merely because it inconveniences us. Study Paul's life, bow your head in shame and sincere repentance and begin to emulate Paul.

**2**

V. 28. The care of all churches. He prayed for them continually, 1 Cor. 1:4; Phil. 1:3, 4; Col. 1:3, 9. His letters throughout bear testimony of his solicitous care for the welfare of all congregations established by himself and others; cp. Rom. 1:8-15; 2 Cor. 2:13, 14; 7:5-16; Gal. 1; Acts 14:21, 22; 15:36; etc.

Christ demands like interest on your part in the welfare of His kingdom. Prayer, Matt. 9:38; Eph. 6:18-20; mission-work, Matt.

28:19, 20; interest in the affairs of the Church, Eph. 6:21, 22. Do you pray? Do you know what is going on in your congregation, your District, your Synod, the Church at large? Do you know where our missionaries are stationed and their trials and dangers and hardships? What do you do for them? Do you read your church-papers? Surely there is much room for improvement!

Paul has the welfare of the individual Christians at heart, v. 29. He feels the weakness of his brother as his own, endeavors to strengthen each individual Christian; cp. Acts 20:20, 31; and he burns with holy indignation whenever any one is offended, cp. Gal. 1:6-9; 5:12; 2 Cor. 11:15.

Like care for the individual is demanded of every Christian, Matt. 18:15-18; Rom. 14; 1 Cor. 8. Are we so solicitous for the spiritual welfare of our brethren? A team seeks to keep all its members in perfect physical condition; else the whole team may suffer defeat. So let us, like Paul, be our brothers' keepers. 1 Cor. 12:12 ff.; 2 Cor. 1:24; Col. 3:16; Heb. 10:24, 25.

### 3

V. 30. Paul does not boast of his accomplishments, his strength, though he might have done so, vv. 21, 22; Phil. 3:4-6. He boasts rather of what men have done to him in order to show their contempt and hatred. And he knows that even such boasting is regarded foolishness by his opponents, v. 23. Yet he gladly boasts of his weakness, so that the power of Christ may rest upon him, chap. 12:9, of that Christ who had told him, 12:9. Cf. Is. 57:15.

Let us not boast of our accomplishments, our virtues, our numbers, our prowess, our wisdom. Pride goeth before the fall. Let us boast of Him who unto the world is foolishness, Christ Crucified. Let us glory in the fact that His grace is made perfect, its saving, sanctifying, life-giving power manifested most clearly, by the fact that it builds and preserves the Church of God through weak, sinful, mortal beings. To this grace be glory forever! And in its strength let us become ever more faithful servants of our gracious Savior.

TH. LAETSCH

### Invocavit

1 Pet. 1:17-25

Lent—a time for devout meditation, for reflecting on the vanity of our “vain conversation received by tradition” etc., cf. *Apology* 4:12, and trusting in the “fountain filled with blood.” Lent—a time for renewed consecration by the power of truth (Gospel) through the Spirit.

To produce such meditation coupled with consecration, the Holy Spirit uses means. These means presented in our text as

### The Incorrputible Seed

1. *What this seed is*      2. *What this seed produces*

#### 1

The seed which is to be planted in our hearts is the Gospel, the very heart of which is the message of Lent. "The Gospel is the divine teaching of the gracious forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ Jesus unto eternal life." The Gospel teaches that we are redeemed (vv. 18, 19), that a ransom was paid for us; not silver and gold; coins are not current in the spiritual realm. Sin is so great an evil that it cannot be eradicated by corruptible means. Not even well-intended religious works "received by tradition" are acceptable ransom. These themselves must be atoned for; never can they be the means of salvation. Cf. Paul, Luther. The ransom paid for the sin of the world was the precious blood of Christ. Is. 53:5; Matt. 20:28; Titus 2:14; Eph. 1:7; Heb. 7:26, 27. Illustrations from the Passion History. The passive obedience of Christ. Rom. 5:8, 9.

The Gospel is also the teaching of the active obedience of Christ, the "Lamb without blemish and without spot." "Jesus Christ had no blemish within Himself, nor did He contract imperfections from without." Bengel. His life was perfect. He fulfilled all the Law, Matt. 5:17, for us, Gal. 4:4, 5.

This Gospel is no afterthought on the part of God to cover up some possible defect in Creation, v. 20. Christ was foreordained. He did not become incarnate to show us what the human race would have been like without sin. (Being a perfect model is only incidental to His coming.) From eternity the everlasting God had determined to save sinners through the redemptive work of Christ.

This Gospel stands on solid ground. It is approved and underwritten by God through Christ's resurrection and glorification, v. 21. God by exalting Him at His own right hand in heaven, proved that the Gospel is His message to men. Phil. 2:9; 1 Tim. 3:16; Eph. 1:20, 21.

Considering the facts our text presents about the incorruptible seed, we are not surprised at the descriptive words applied. Imperishable: While man and all the glory of man—even his most profound philosophies—are perishable as the flower of the grass, v. 24, the Gospel is the incorruptible gift of God. Apology 23:70. Since it is of God, the source of life, it is itself living. It abides forever, v. 23; Heb. 9:12.

This blessed Gospel of Christ's service and sacrifice according to God's plan is unfolded by the entire Lenten story. Nothing else can ever take its place, Gal. 1:8. The Gospel also produces most blessed fruits.

## 2

When other seed is sown, it undergoes radical changes. Not so this incorruptible seed. It does, however, change that with which it comes into contact. When this seed is planted in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, we are born again, v. 23; Jas. 1:18. In former times "enthusiasts" claimed they produced regeneration by the "inner light"; now Modernists attempt the same through the social gospel. God, however, has established only one means of regeneration, and this is effective. It produces faith in us. V. 21.

In this faith we call God Father. V. 17. It makes us children of God, reestablishes the proper relation between Creator and creature.

We receive power to sojourn here in fear, v. 17, to walk circumspectly, "purifying your souls." Cf. Acts 15:9. The incorruptible seed produces fruit of good works, pleasing to God, true reverence and veneration of God. Gen. 39:9.

Unfeigned love of the brethren. Being born again of incorruptible seed, we have become members of a new family; not only God's children but also brothers and sisters of our fellow-Christians. Outside the Gospel there is no true brotherhood among men. Titus 3:3; Mark 10:29, 30. This seed the means of ending wars among nations; dissension in churches; strife in families. It creates the proper relation between husband and wife; parents and children; etc. Charitable institutions, etc., are a result of the Gospel.

You need this incorruptible seed, since God judges "without respect of persons," v. 17. Let not Lent with its glorious message pass you by unmoved. Seed sown on barren ground transforms it into a place of beauty; thus incorruptible seed changes your lives of vanity to faith that proves itself through love to God and man.

VICTOR MENNICKE



---

**Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches**

**Man Does Not Love Sola Gratia.**—Under this heading Rev. F. R. Webber of Boston, Mass., has sent in the following interesting news item to be published in the "Theological Observer" of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY. The Rev. Mr. Webber writes:

"The great success of Mr. J. H. Pedlar in Cornwall may have come to an end. He has carried on this work for six years, all the while supporting himself by means of secular work during the week. Not only has it been a thrilling chapter in our missionary history, but it has proved overwhelmingly that a fearless preaching of sin and salvation will stir the hearts of the people in this day when only too many are proclaiming the greatness of man and of man's ability to work his way into heaven by means of good conduct.

"For six years Mr. Pedlar has been given free use of a number of chapels belonging to another denomination. For this kindness we have been genuinely appreciative. But now comes the day when a new church official has appeared on the scene and has decided, definitely and finally, that there are to be no more Lutheran services in those non-Lutheran chapels. Efforts have been in vain, and Mr. Pedlar is at last forced to remain silent, simply because there is no available place of worship. With the doubtful exception of a schoolroom in an inconvenient location, there are no halls or empty storerooms to be had. Moreover, the people of Cornwall are poor. The tin mining industry, once the source of great prosperity, has been at a standstill for over 50 years. Cornwall has long been a depressed area. Just now heavy taxation has added to the plight of the people. It is clear that only immediate assistance from America can save the day.

"The situation is of particular interest because of its theological angle. It is but one more evidence that *sola gratia* meets with opposition wherever it is proclaimed. While the common people hear it with great joy, yet there are others, usually of the more learned classes, who are filled with resentment when told that man can do nothing whatever to assist in his own salvation. Church dignitaries would have stoned Luther to death for his preaching of salvation through the righteousness and death of Christ alone. Wesley was mobbed in London, in Newcastle, and in Bristol when he discovered the same truth and attempted to preach it, and it was high dignitaries, not the common people, who were responsible for the riots. The attempt to silence Mr. Pedlar is but one more of a long list of such incidents. At least one other denomination tried, only three years ago, to lure him away from us by flattering offers; but this brave missionary preferred to remain an unsalaried witness to the truth, living in a small rural cottage under conditions similar to those on our own frontier half a century ago. He might have had honor, recognition, and a comfortable mode of living had he accepted this offer.

"The men who have silenced him temporarily are not evil men.

They are misguided. Rationalism is by no means dead, and it is man's reason that argues: 'If we preach salvation through the merits of Christ alone, we are reducing man to a mere automaton.' That is an old argument, and it is the excuse for Pelagianism in Cornwall today. Proud human reason will not permit itself to bow completely to the Savior. Man insists upon having at least a small part in the work of salvation; hence the stress by the Rationalists, in Cornwall and elsewhere on the merits of wrestling and prayer. But truth prevails, and in some way, we hope, speedy help will be forthcoming so that this conspicuous work of our lone representative in the 'Delectable Duchy' will go on."

Of course, other reasons might be given why Mr. Pedlar's work in Cornwall was stopped. He was using the chapels of established congregations to preach "new doctrines." For the same reason St. Paul in his day was forbidden the use of the synagogues when he testified that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. But when Pastor Webber says that "man does not love the *sola gratia*," he calls attention to the chief and decisive reason. Luther is right when he says: "Das Evangelium muss rumoren; es kann nicht still sein und Ruhe werden, wo es hinkommt" (III, 285).

J. T. M.

**On the Negotiations between the Presbyterians and Episcopalians.** According to the report in the *Living Church* (Protestant Episcopal) the commissions of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. (Northern Presbyterians) and of the Protestant Episcopal Church met November 5 and 6, 1941, in Chicago and state that they made "substantial progress." From the report we take over a few sentences. "It was mutually agreed that 'insofar as it is expedient, all missionary work of the two Churches shall be developed in cooperation.' Also, that 'each Church shall send regular, official representatives to the councils of the other Church.' . . . Probably the most important matter which was considered in the joint session was the outline of a possible fundamental structure of a united church. Eight articles dealing with major aspects of such a plan were drafted. These articles relate to doctrine, worship, general church government, the ministry, the Sacraments, the ruling eldership, the reception into communicant membership, the place of the laity, and the rights of local congregations. These articles were referred to the committee which had prepared them for the consideration of the joint session for further study and amplification." The tentative formulation of a plan making an exchange of ministers possible was turned over to a special committee "for study and report at the next joint meeting." A.

**The Witness of the Bible Presbyterian Church.** — The Fourth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church met in Charlotte, N. C., for three days, beginning October 14. As moderator Rev. E. A. Dillard, pastor of the host church in Charlotte, was elected. The next meeting of the General Synod is to take place in St. Louis, Mo., beginning November 5, 1942. The convention in Charlotte voted a special resolution of thanks for the many blessings which God during the past year again showered upon the troubled, but nevertheless victorious Church and reaffirmed the previous resolutions regarding the Independent Board for Presbyterian

Foreign Missions, Faith Theological Seminary, a separated Christian life, total abstinence from intoxicating beverages, the *Christian Beacon*, and religious liberty. We see here a mixture of truth and error. A resolution on the recently organized American Council of Churches says: "Whereas the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America does not adequately represent historic Christianity; and whereas because of its usurpation of all free radio time allocated to religious work, the fundamental principle of Americanism, namely, freedom of religion and speech, is fast becoming a thing of the past; and whereas the American Council of Churches is dedicated to the preaching of the everlasting Gospel and to the proposition that this Gospel should be preached over the air lanes: therefore be it resolved that we commend the American Council to our people for their support, prayers, and interest." While there is much in the theology of these people which we reject, we must commend them for their warfare on Modernism in its many forms.

J. T. M.

**The American Council of Christian Churches Organized.**—A number of prominent Fundamentalists have organized the American Council of Christian Churches in opposition to the Federal Council of Churches. In announcing its formation, the Council issued the following statement:

"We are thankful that we live in free America. Too long the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has assumed to speak for all Protestants. It has, in fact, been a general instrument of soul-destroying Modernism. Its 'social gospel' is actually 'another gospel,' sometimes hardly to be distinguished from outright communistic propaganda. It has gone far afield into political and economic activity. America needs spiritual leadership. She needs Jesus Christ as never before, not theories of social welfare. The shed blood of Jesus Christ alone can wash away sin. We need a revival desperately, but it can never come until men confess their sins, repent, and put their trust in Jesus Christ, God's only-begotten Son. The Holy Spirit, speaking through the Scriptures, can give the blessing, security, and comfort for which men's souls cry.

"Bible-believers are not against a common testimony as such, but they cannot support the Federal Council because of its false unity, compromise with the Gospel, and exaltation of men who deny many of the essentials of the faith. The Federal Council in its claim to be the voice of American Protestantism shares, together with the Roman Catholic and Jewish agencies, many outlets of expression, including free radio time. In democratic and free America we protest against the Federal Council's monopoly of these outlets and their use of them to disseminate 'another gospel.' These outlets should be available to others who are not now represented. It is not American that outstanding Gospel-preachers who proclaim the message of God's grace which made America great and free should be compelled to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars for radio time, while it is given free to others with a contrary message. The Protestant faith in its historic reality and blessing must be presented to America, or America will lose its liberty. The time has come when those who love the Lord Jesus Christ and His infallible Word, the Bible, must make this united stand."

The men prominently identified with this movement to check the baneful influence of the Federal Council are aggressive Fundamentalists and are nationally known for their opposition to Modernism in the Baptist, Methodist, and particularly the Presbyterian churches. Rev. Carl McIntire of the Bible Presbyterian Church is president, Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths of the same Church is general secretary. Ernst Gordon of the *Sunday School Times*, Dr. W. H. Houghton of the Moody Bible Institute, Dr. A. A. MacRae of Faith Theological Seminary, are taking an active part in this movement. As is well known, these men insist on the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. The Council is organized under the following departments: Evangelism, information and publication, home missions, foreign missions, Christian education, and radio.

F. E. M.

**No Freedom in Russia.**—Few will be deceived by the London-Washington propaganda to the effect that the Catholic Church, and every other religious body in Russia can build churches, open schools, publish books and magazines, preach, and administer the Sacraments, just as the Catholic Church does in the United States. The simple truth is that under a communistic government religion must be destroyed as an enemy of the State. The so-called Soviet Constitution does not guarantee religious freedom; it permits merely "freedom to perform religious rites." Even this guarantee has never been permitted to function. The wrecked churches of Russia, its desecrated shrines, many turned to shockingly irrelegious purposes, and the few remaining Catholic priests who administer the Sacraments at peril of their lives, afford ample evidence that under the Soviet there is no religious liberty and under Communism can be none!

What Stalin understands by the term is the freedom of the individual to profess his religion in private. But he may not profess it in public without restriction, and he is not allowed to propagate it. Yet, as Cardinal Hinsley recently said, governments must be made to understand "that the practice of the Christian religion is something carried on in a communion, that it is a social activity, the work of a society, and not something pursued by individuals in isolation. Hence, liberty of worship is incomplete for any Christian if it is not understood to mean liberty for religious communions to live their integral lives as societies, maintaining, for instance, a religious setting and atmosphere for the children of their members and engaging without hindrance in those spiritual and corporal works of mercy which are the living expression of our faith."

Against the assumptions of the London-Washington propaganda both the present Holy Father and his predecessor have solemnly protested. In March, 1937, Pius XI wrote of "the horrors perpetrated in Russia" and said plainly that "where Communism has been able to assert its power—and here we are thinking with special affection of the people of Russia and Mexico—it has striven by all possible means . . . to destroy Christian civilization and the Christian religion by banishing every remembrance of them from the hearts of men, especially of the young."

Between the war-propagandists and the Popes, solely concerned with the rights of all men and of God, Catholics will hear and believe the Popes.

For war purposes the propagandists picture Russia under Communism as a land of complete religious freedom. The Popes have denounced Communism in Russia and wherever else it is found as "the fatal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society, only to bring about its ruin," (Leo XIII) as "a doctrine in which there is no room for the idea of God," as an ideology which "subverts the social order," and "denies the rights, dignity, and liberty of human personality." — *America* (Roman Catholic).

**On Mixed Marriages in Quebec Province, Canada.** — The hard times experienced by those who entered into mixed marriages in Quebec Province, Canada, since 1908, have been effectively ended (week of September 21) by the Provincial Court of Appeals. The judicial authorities (four of the five judges were themselves Catholic) decided that "a papal decree did not change Quebec's laws." Prior to 1908 mixed marriages in Quebec Province encountered no legal obstacles, though naturally subject to the local displeasure of the spiritual authorities of Holy Church. This was due to the extension to Canada by Clement XIII (1764) of the 1741 decree of Benedict XIV, granting that in the Netherlands and Belgium a Catholic could marry a "heretic" without observance of Catholic ritual. After Pius X revoked this "Benedictine Dispensation" (1908), the Catholic judges of the province uniformly decided that mixed marriages, performed without the "due precautions" exercised by a Catholic priest, were invalid, also illegal, since the judges interpreted the civil code provisions of 1866, namely, that impediments to marriage "remain subject to the rules followed hitherto in the various churches," solely in terms of the 1908 ruling by Pius X. More than 100 Quebec mixed marriages have been annulled by this procedure since 1908. It would be interesting to conjecture whether this recent decision could have any retroactive effect upon the annulments, though it is stated that many of them were the result of collusion by the married couples. The case that brought about the recent final decision was not instituted by the parties of a mixed marriage but by an Anglican person who represented the attack upon his legal power, as well as upon his spiritual right, to officiate in such a marriage. That accounts for the Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph*'s editorial comment: "It is not for the Catholic Church to impose an inferior status on the clergy of other denominations before the civil law or to penalize innocent parties because one of its own members has failed to respect the canon law."

*The Lutheran* (U. L. C. A.)

**Shailer Mathews Deceased.** — On October 22 there died Shailer Mathews, for many years dean of the divinity school of the University of Chicago. The press carried many encomiums of this educator. It is said that while he was dean, about three thousand students passed through the divinity school. A strange circumstance is that in spite of his position as the head of a divinity school he was never ordained. Apparently he looked upon it as a distinction that moving among

ministers as their equal he nevertheless was a layman. Shailer Mathews started out as a historian. A book that brought him fame was his history of the French Revolution. When he turned to theology and there gave his attention especially to the field of doctrine, he revealed himself as an arch-Modernist. Works of his in which his antagonism to the old Bible theology became very evident are, for instance, "The Faith of Modernism" and "The Contribution of Science to Religion." What attracted him especially was the social aspect of theological thinking and work. He was one of the most prominent advocates of the so-called "social gospel." It is not surprising that he likewise sponsored the plan of uniting the various church-bodies. Older readers of this journal will remember that he was president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. When the World Conference on International Peace through Religion met in Stockholm in 1928, he served as chairman. While personally a friendly and kindly man, in theology he was the very antithesis of almost everything for which this journal contends. A.

**No Missionaries Have Withdrawn Because of Lack of Funds.**— So far as it is known, no Christian missionaries anywhere have been compelled to withdraw from their fields because of lack of money, the International Missionary Council reports regarding the state of the foreign missions "orphaned" because of the war.

A recent financial report shows that in the last two years more than \$1,300,000 has been contributed by individuals and organizations throughout the world—excluding Roman Catholics—to sustain missions temporarily separated from their parent churches in Europe. More than \$1,000,000 of the total contributions came from the United States, divided almost equally between relief for continental missions and relief for British missions. Over \$300,000 of the more than \$500,000 given by Americans for the relief of British missions constituted the Aid to British Missions Fund sent by the Episcopal Church to the Archbishop of Canterbury. According to these figures the Episcopal Church has, therefore, contributed over 25 per cent. of the total funds sent from the United States for the relief of orphaned missions.

No figures can show the large amount of aid given by British, Dutch, Swedish, and American missions to neighboring missions, often of other communions, temporarily in desperate financial straits or deprived of their staff because of internment measures.

One hundred sixty-eight missions are now known to be cut off from their regular sources of support. One hundred seventeen called for help during the last year. Others have supported their work on meager and fast disappearing reserves. It is therefore likely, in the opinion of the missionary council, that \$1,500,000 must be contributed by Christians in North America if the orphaned missions are to be maintained for another year. *Living Church* (Protestant-Episcopal)

**Modernistic Patter at Princeton.**—Dean Luther A. Weigle, of Yale University Divinity School and President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, delivered the principal address at the Alumni Dinner, Princeton Theological Seminary, May 12, 1941. The address was printed in the August issue of the *Princeton Seminary*

Bulletin under the heading "Democracy, Education, and Faith in God." As the *Christian Beacon* (Sept. 25, 1941) shows by quotation, this is what Dr. Weigle had to say on the teachings of Jesus in their relation to faith in God: "Jesus' teaching was with authority because it seemed to His hearers to be true. It met their minds. Jesus' appeal was reasonable as well as direct. His tone was not that of a law-giver, who commands; not that of a despot, who threatens or cajoles. Jesus spoke as one who discerns the truth and set it before others in order that they, too, might see it and in its light decide the issues which impend. He stirred his hearers to think for themselves in view of the relevant facts. He was no propagandist, capturing the minds of people by appeals to prejudice or passion. His language was restrained and fair; His appeal was to intelligence, conscience, and will rather than to emotion or to the psychology of the crowd." Editorially the *Christian Beacon* remarks on this address: "The President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America was invited to deliver an address at Princeton Theological Seminary. Before the reorganization of that institution such an invitation would have been impossible. But Dr. Weigle came and in his address questioned whether Jesus Christ spoke the quotation given in the fourth gospel (the reference is to the words: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," occurring in a part of the speech which we omitted for lack of space), and then said that Jesus had authority because His teachings seemed to His hearers to be true and that Jesus spoke as one who discerns the truth. No, Jesus was the truth! He is the truth, and His authority came not because His hearers attributed it to Him, but because He was and is the Son of God. So we have the typical Modernist patter: 'We do not know whether the words of the Bible given us are true or accurate, but there is a spirit in them that manifests an acceptable teaching.' To question this (the divine authority of Christ) as Dr. Weigle does, is to cast aside the whole doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures which has been the citadel of Protestantism." [Italics our own.]

Dr. Weigle's remarks on Jesus' teachings of course are not historically true. To the majority of his hearers they seemed neither true nor reasonable nor appealing. Jesus was just as unpopular among the modernistic teachers of His time as are true ministers of the Gospel among present-day Modernists. His authority was questioned time and again, and as Dr. McIntire rightly says, He had authority only because He is the Son of God. We deeply appreciate this testimony to the truth by the valiant editor of the *Christian Beacon*, as also his timely remark on verbal inspiration.

J. T. M.

**Leper Work in Korea.**—While mission-work in the Far East is sadly hampered, it has not as yet been entirely suppressed. Rev. Allen D. Clark gives a description in the *Presbyterian* of work among the lepers in Korea which our readers will be glad to peruse:

"Many, if not most, people regard leprosy as utterly hopeless of cure, and it must be confessed that the cure is a long, slow process. But it can be cured, and is being cured, in many hundreds of cases. In Korea there are four leper colonies. One is run by the government and the

other three by missionaries. Our own mission has one at Taiku, the Australians at Rusan, and the Southern Presbyterians near Soonchun, all in the southern part of the country. In Taiku the patients live in brick dormitories. Much emphasis is placed on stock-raising, and the policy is, in general, to take in no one for whom there is not some hope that he can be turned out as cured within a few years. Clinical treatment is given for incurable or deformed cases at various centers, but they are not taken into the colony itself. You will readily understand the reason for this when you stop to think that there is only so much space available, and the doctors in charge feel that they will accomplish more if the available space is utilized for those who can be sent out cured, thus making room for others who need the help that the colony can give. At our own colony at Taiku nearly all the work is done by the patients, and the life of the community goes on much as it would in any normal Christian Korean village. They have their school and their church, and from time to time they have Bible conferences and an annual Bible institute. About half the process of curing the patients is concerned with their mental and spiritual adjustment rather than with physical treatment. The treatment is chiefly in the form of injections of chalmoogra oil; but there are often other ailments along with the leprosy which need treatment. Apart from all this, however, one of the most important things is to help the patient to realize that he is wanted, that he is no longer an outcast, with his hand against every man and every man's hand against him. This is why an effort is made to make the life in the colony as nearly like that in a well-regulated Korean village as possible. And, of course, above everything else, the spiritual rehabilitation of the patient is the most important."

A.

**Brief Items.** — Social agencies and religious organizations of the State regard with appreciation the retention by Illinois of its three-day marriage license law under recent attack and applaud Iowa's recent enactment of a pre-marital physical examination requiring it. The clergy are little concerned about marriage fees lost across the border to adjacent Gretna Greens but are deeply concerned for the enduring quality of marriages. — *Christian Century*.

The treasurer of the Albert Schweitzer Fellowship, Mr. Everett Skillings of Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., announces that Dr. Schweitzer is still carrying on his work as missionary doctor at Lambarene in French Equatorial Africa. His support is almost entirely restricted to donations sent him from this country. The Doctor Schweitzer Fellowship sent him one thousand dollars last year and another thousand dollars this year. Besides, it furnished him one thousand dollars worth of medicines and food. The statement is made that its funds have approached the vanishing point. Unfortunately, this brilliant man is an arch-Modernist.

According to the *Living Church* the so-called Old Catholic Church numbers 500,000 members in continental Europe. With the exception of those living in Switzerland, all these people are found in Germany or German-occupied countries. It will be recalled that the Old Catholic

Church was founded in protest against the papal infallibility dogma proclaimed in 1870.

When recently Missionary Bruno H. Luebeck, representing Northern Baptists, died in China on account of overwork, the *Watchman-Examiner* stated that "His life was forfeit to the indifference and selfish indulgence of Northern Baptists." We mention this not to throw stones at the Northern Baptists, but rather to urge ourselves to do some searching in our own hearts and minds with respect to the missionaries whom we send to the heathen.

It is interesting to note that while only native Mexicans are permitted to hold the ministerial office in any church in Mexico, lecturing and preaching by citizens of other countries is not forbidden. Evidently the view taken by the legislators is that one must distinguish between delivering sermons and lectures and holding the ministerial office.

When Bishop Cannon of the Methodist Church advocated a militant anti-German stand of our Government, he received bushels of communications, of which one third approved of what he had said while the other two thirds "denounced him as unworthy to be called a Christian, much less a bishop of the Methodist Church." It is a dangerous thing for a clergyman to meddle in politics.

In Cincinnati has been issued by a Roman Catholic priest a pamphlet having the title "Apostolate to Assist Dying Non-Catholics." It is described as "a means of assisting well-meaning non-Catholics to die a happy death or to lead them to the light of the one true faith." The position taken by the author in making salvation depend on certain acts (the act of repentance, the act of faith) is strikingly in conformity with the fundamental views of Romanism which has changed the Gospel into a new law.

The U. L. C. A. lost a prominent scholar through the death of Prof. L. Franklin Gruber, who for the last fourteen years served his Church as president of the Chicago Lutheran Seminary at Maywood, Ill. Among his acquaintances and friends he was known as a collector of N. T. manuscripts, and it is said that he owned some rare treasures belonging to this category.

At Eden Seminary, formerly operated by the Evangelical Synod and now owned by the merger called the "Evangelical and Reformed Church," a new president was inaugurated September 17, Prof. Frederick W. Schroeder. His predecessor, Dr. Press, continues as a member of the faculty.

In Seattle, Wash., recently a Buddhist temple was dedicated. The cost of it was about \$100,000.00. One is not surprised to read that the building boasts a gymnasium and social rooms. Among those assisting at the dedication was Mrs. James Wesley Pratt of Tacoma, who is reported to be the only active Buddhist priestess in the United States. It is only with deep sorrow that one can think and speak of matters of this kind.

A.

## Book Review — Literatur

---

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

### Treasures from the Greek New Testament for the English Reader.

By Kenneth S. Wuest. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 136 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ . Price, \$1.00.

One need not hesitate to call this little work a worth-while book. Two features which place it far above most scholarly books produced today are its acceptance of the inerrancy and authority of the Scriptures and its clear proclamation of the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement of the God-man Jesus Christ. The work concerns itself with little points of exegesis, which, however, since they pertain to the sacred text, are matters of importance for every Bible Christian. By dwelling on connotations of words like those translated "to visit" and "to forsake," the author endeavors to unfold the riches of the original to the English reader. Now and then, however, very weighty questions are discussed, for instance, in the chapter having the heading "Is Future Punishment Everlasting?" (P. 34.) The author here adheres to what the Scriptures say, the protests of sentimental reason notwithstanding.

But while the book in the main in its discussion of words and phrases, stressing matters of grammar and lexicography, sets forth Scripture doctrine, there are a few exceptions. My dissent was evoked by the millennial notions expressed on page 70, likewise by the assertion (p. 63) that the expression "son of man" quoted Heb. 2:6 from Ps. 8 is "a designation of the human race." When the author discusses the meaning of Baptism, he states, "It is the testimony of the person to the fact of his salvation. The only proper recipient of water baptism therefore is one who has received the Lord Jesus as his personal Savior and is trusting in His precious blood for salvation from sin" (p. 78). That statement evidently is too sweeping. In the case of an adult, of course, Baptism should be an indication that he or she has accepted Jesus as Savior and Lord, but when an infant is baptized, such acceptance is not a thing to be presupposed but to be accomplished in the Sacrament. Likewise I would reject the author's view that when Paul in Rom. 6:3, 4 speaks of Baptism he has in mind the so-called baptism with the Holy Spirit (p. 84). The assumption is all the more strange because the Apostle in the whole context does not mention the Holy Spirit. In the discussion on the meaning of the word baptism (p. 84 ff.) scholarship suffers through the failure of the author to distinguish between *bapto* and *baptizo*. In spite of the close connection of the two words, it is hardly fair to ascribe to Homer and Xenophon the use of the latter when they merely employ the former. Prof. John A. Scott, who is introduced as an authority, I am sure, has been misquoted.

W. ARNDT

**Reason or Revelation?** By Theodore Engelder, D.D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 176 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

God's revelation as voiced and penned by the prophets and apostles of God has at all times been a stumbling-block and foolishness to human reason. When Paul preached the resurrection of Jesus, Festus bluntly told him that he had lost his reason, that he was insane, Acts 26:24. The philosophers in Athens mocked Paul and called him a babbler, a man who had hatched a crazy idea and was defending it in order to make a living or to secure a standing among the learned men or at least to gain some publicity. Yet Paul did not think of ceasing from proclaiming that Gospel which he knew to be the power of God and the wisdom of God. When Jeremiah wrote to his captive countrymen in Babylon the words which God had put into his mouth, Shemayah, one of their leaders, demanded that Jeremiah be put in prison and stocks as a madman, an insane fellow, Jer. 29:24-29. Yet Jeremiah could not cease from publishing the revelation of God, unreasonable though it might seem. God's Word was in his heart as a burning fire shut up in his bones, which he could not stay. Jer. 20:9. Man will resort to the greatest follies in his endeavor to silence the Word of revelation. Ahab would rather listen to four hundred flattering prophets of lies than to one prophet revealing to the wicked king truths he did not want to hear. And this one prophet disregarded the counsel of a well-meaning friend to be reasonable and to flatter like the rest, and suffered smiting and imprisonment rather than to put reason above revelation. 1 Kings 22.

The author of *Reason or Revelation?* is not like Paul or Jeremiah or Micah an inspired prophet, but like them he puts revelation where it belongs and reason in its proper place. He humbly submits to all that God has revealed by mouth and pen of prophets and apostles. He brings his reason into captivity to the obedience of Christ who has said, "Scripture cannot be broken." He proclaims as one of the first requisites of the Christian religion to believe that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, that it is true what Christ says, "Thy Word is truth." The author is fully aware that the princes of modern theology will take little or no notice of his book, and that if they do not disregard it entirely, they will ridicule the antiquated standpoint he takes and express their sorrow that he was born two or three centuries too late. The author does not seek honor with men. His sole purpose is to honor his God and the Word of the Lord of hosts, God's revelation, that Holy Bible written by holy men of God as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. In a manner truly overwhelming he points out the folly, the sinfulness, the danger, the fatal consequences of permitting man's reason to sit in judgment on the Word of God, of granting permission to reason to rule over revelation. He exposes reason to be Satan's paramour, "the mistress of a thousand wiles" (p. 148): the *inimica fidei*, the arch-enemy of faith, no matter whether she comes in the heavy armor of rationalistic philosophy, evolutionism, science, or blasphemous atheism; whether she comes clothed in the garment of Roman, or Reformed, or Fundamentalist argumentation; or whether she proudly raises the banner of scientific Lutheranism. Always and ever, by which name she is called, reason is

wily Satan's seductive consort, burning with passionate desire to rob the child of God of his faith and salvation.

We are happy that these chapters, originally written for and published in our CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, are not buried forever in its pages, that they are now being published in book form at an attractive price. We hope that all our pastors and teachers and laymen will read and study this book and derive profit from it.

THEO. LAETSCH

**The Nature and Destiny of Man. A Christian Interpretation. I. Human Nature.** By Reinhold Niebuhr. Charles Scribner's Sons. 306 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ . Price, \$2.75.

This book is receiving high praise. "Not since the days of B. B. Warfield and Charles A. Briggs has America had a theologian who possessed such a grasp of the riches of the Christian theological tradition as does Reinhold Niebuhr. But Niebuhr—and here he is unlike Warfield and Briggs—possesses also an insight into the meaning of Christian doctrine for our own time and an appreciation of the relevance of the findings of modern knowledge for the fresh understanding of Christian truth and for the tasks of the Protestantism of our day" (J. L. Adams, in *Christendom VI*, No. 4, p. 576). And Georgia Harkness says: "This is by all odds the best book R. Niebuhr has written" (*Ibid.*, p. 567). Writers like Georgia Harkness, "in whom the philosopher and the Christian mingle" (Foreword to her book *The Faith by Which the Church Lives*), cannot but like Niebuhr's book, for in him, too, the philosopher and the theologian mingle, and the philosopher speaks much oftener than the theologian. And frequently, when a Bible-truth is presented, it is obscured and even warped by metaphysical and psychological constructions. Confining our review to the theological portions of the book, we will say that Niebuhr deals severely with several phases of liberal theology. He has no patience with those who "make the effort to maintain some contact with the traditional faith by affirming that Jesus was a very, very, very good man but that, of course, a better man might appear at a future date, in which case the loyalty of the faithful would be transferred to him." (P. 146.) And "modern liberal Protestantism knows less of the meaning or significance of the Atonement than the Middle Ages did." (P. 148.) Liberal Protestantism makes little of the Atonement, because it does not know the need of redemption from sin. "Albrecht Ritschl, the most authoritative exponent of modern liberal Christianity, does not appreciate . . . the uniqueness of the Biblical approach to the human problem. . . . The Biblical religion seeks *redemption from sin*." (P. 178.) Modernism does not realize the seriousness of sin. "Modern man has an essentially easy conscience. . . . The idea that man is sinful at the very center of his personality, that is, in his will, is universally rejected." (P. 23.) And "this complacent conscience of modern man," produced by his "inability to recognize the meaning of the dogma of original sin" (p. 93), needs to be awakened. That is the purpose of this book. It delivers smashing blows at the pride of man, does not hesitate to charge human nature with being corrupt, under the fearful wrath of God, and insists on "the logical

absurdity" of holding man responsible for his sins and sinfulness, helpless though he is. "The fact of responsibility is attested by the feeling of remorse or repentance which follows the sinful action." (P. 255.) Man's reason may plead that he cannot be held responsible for what he cannot help doing, but his conscience tells him that his reasoning is wrong. And this "doctrine of sin which offends both rationalists and moralists by maintaining the seemingly absurd position that man sins inevitably but that he is nevertheless to be held responsible," this "doctrine which seems so untenable from a logical standpoint and has been derided and scorned not only by non-Christian philosophers but by many Christian theologians" (p. 241 ff.) is unhesitatingly set forth in the theological sections of our book.

But Niebuhr hesitates when the question of *total depravity* and *inherited sin* is discussed. And thus his good work is to a great extent undone. He does not merely hesitate. He directly denies the Scriptural teaching on this point. He calls it a "literalistic error" that "the Augustinians insisted on interpreting original sin as an inherited taint" (p. 260) and says that Christian theology has frequently expressed the idea of the total depravity of man in extravagant terms. "The most extreme statement of the doctrine of total depravity is probably found in the Lutheran Formulary of Concord, in which we read: 'They are also likewise repudiated and rejected who teach that our nature has indeed been greatly weakened but nevertheless has not altogether lost all goodness relating to divine and spiritual things.'" "Against pessimistic theories of human nature which affirm the total depravity of man it is important to assert the continued presence in man of the *justitia originalis*, of the law of love, as law and requirement." (Pp. 260, 267 ff., 296.) — Similarly, Niebuhr tells the Liberals, who know less of the meaning of the Atonement than the Middle Ages did, that "this doctrine of Atonement and justification is the central truth of the Christian religion." He speaks of "the beauty of vicarious suffering" and does not hesitate to say that "God is Himself the victim of man's sin." But when he then tells the Liberals that "the good news of the Gospel is that God takes the sinfulness of man into Himself and overcomes in His own heart what cannot be overcome in human life," the Liberals will not at all hesitate to accept such a definition of vicarious atonement. (P. 142 ff.)

The trouble with the theological sections of our book is that Scripture is not taken as the basis and the sole authority of religious teaching. Niebuhr feels at liberty, for instance, to deny the Bible account of the fall of man. He speaks of it consistently as "the myth of the Fall." "Christian theology has fallen into the literalistic error of insisting upon the Fall as an historical event." (P. 267.) He will even go so far as to pen these words: "In Pauline theology death is the consequence of sin.... It is probable that St. Paul followed the rabbinic teaching of his day in the belief that death was the consequence of Adam's sin." (P. 174.) Modern liberal Protestantism would call that a fine statement.

We have often wondered what truths, "what a profound prophetic philosophy of history" are hidden in this "myth of the Fall." Niebuhr

can tell us. Read pages 276—296. "If 'before the Fall' is not an historical period, the questions are: (1) Where is the locus of this perfection as requirement upon man; and (2) what is its character and content?" Answer: "Perfection before the Fall is perfection before the act." And what is this perfection, this what theology calls *justitia originalis*? Answer: "The original righteousness or perfection is present with sinful man as 'law.' . . . This righteousness is not completely lost in the Fall but remains with sinful man as the knowledge of what he ought to be, as the law of his freedom." Is that what Scripture means when it presents to us "the myth of the Fall"? Yes. "In placing the consciousness of 'original righteousness' in a moment of the self which transcends history, though not outside of the self which is in history, it may be relevant to observe that this conforms perfectly to the myth of the Fall when interpreted symbolically. . . . This is a symbol for the whole of human history." The ordinary reader may not understand the distinction between the self which transcends history and the self which is in history, but when Niebuhr summarizes his interpretation of the "myth of the Fall," we understand him perfectly. This is the summary: "Against pessimistic theories of human nature which affirm the *total depravity of man* [our italics], it is important to assert the continued presence in man of the *justitia originalis*, of the law of love, as law and requirement." "The disavowal of the historical-literalistic illusion, which places the original perfection of man in a period before an historical fall, thus clarifies and corrects both Catholic and Protestant thought. Against Protestant thought it becomes possible to maintain that the image of God is preserved in spite of man's sin." That we understand perfectly. Human nature is, according to Niebuhr, not as bad as Luther and Augustin and Paul painted it. And so the good work of Niebuhr is altogether undone. He set out to awaken the complacent conscience of modern man. But telling it that man is not totally depraved lulls it back into sleep.

TH. ENGELDER

**What Is Christianity?** By Charles Clayton Morrison. Willett, Clark and Co., Chicago, Ill. 324 pages, 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ×8 $\frac{1}{2}$ . Price, \$3.00.

In this volume, at present widely discussed by liberals and conservatives, Dr. Morrison, well-known modernist editor of *The Christian Century*, investigates the essence of Christianity, but this only as the means to an end, as he shows at the close of his book. Unlike Harnack (Kant) and other older Rationalists, he does not regard Christianity substantially as morality; and unlike traditional Christian theology he does not consider Christianity to consist basically in faith in Christ or in any specific Christian creed, for to him distinctive creeds are only so many "ideologies" (essentially unchristian by their very existence as such, since like ancient Gnosticism they "take Christianity out of history"). (Cf. p. 24 ff.) To Morrison Christianity is God's self-disclosure in history, yet not in a supernatural way, as divine revelation is professed also by traditional Christian theology, but "by so orientating the community toward Himself that it can perceive and receive the particular event as revelation" (p. 77). "History is the human medium of God's creative action, or conversely, the field of divine creativity in

which man takes his human part as a coworker with God" (p. 79). Morrison endeavors to make this thought clear by the analogy of the building of a house, in which act by the exercise of intelligence and labor, man cooperates with divine powers which hold stone and board in place, or by that of the plowing and sowing which the farmer does, trusting in God to give the increase. (Cf. p. 81.) "This conscious orientation," Morrison claims, "toward the preventient and transcending creativity of God in the entire continuum of events is Christian faith" (p. 81). Christianity has so come into existence in Old Testament Judaism and in New Testament communal activity, for here and here alone (Morrison excludes all pagan sects from sharing in Christianity's prerogative) there was "conscious orientation toward divine creativity." Now, the visible community in which there is such conscious orientation toward God, is the "body of Christ," which is nothing else than the visible, tangible community, calling itself the Christian Church. Against this visible body of Christ Romanism has sinned by becoming guilty of schism, so revealing itself as the great apostasy. (Cf. p. 199.) But also Protestantism has sinned against this body of Christ, for it has placed the locus of revelation in the Bible and the locus of salvation in the inner life [?] of the individual Christian. (Cf. p. 200.) In other words, it has taken the Bible as the divine revelation and so it has taken Christianity out of history. There is no heresy in the traditional sense of the term. "Heresy is sin, not because the heretical doctrine is wrong but because the heretic is wrong. And he is wrong, not because he holds convictions which diverge from the generally accepted formulation of the Church's creed, but because he pushes his divergent views to the point of dividing the Christian community" (p. 312). The Church's great objective, then, is to become united externally, so that the body of Christ may no longer remain dismembered. The traditional external forms of Christian expression — church order, baptism, ordination, Christian missions, Christian education, liturgy, the Eucharist, and even creeds (for all of which Morrison gives detailed directions) — may be retained. However, there must not be any heretical (separatistic) emphasis on any distinctive form, for here the "catholic functions of the Christian community" must be exercised, determining the "normative ideology" [i. e., the creed] of the community. At present, none of the existing denominations (least of all, the Roman Catholic because of its demand of obedience) can qualify for serving as Morrison's creedless, faithless, Gospel-less "body of Christ," though he admits that the "Church of England has recently given an enlightening illustration of the application of the catholic principle in the sphere of the Church's beliefs," since there "no attempt was made to raise the doctrine as a basis of fellowship" (p. 315), its "statement of Christian doctrine being oriented to fellowship, not toward schism." Morrison, then, regards as Christianity the community which is "conscious of divine revelation," even though it does not accept the Bible as God's revelation and the Christian faith as the way of salvation. Really, it was not at all necessary for Morrison to write his basically antichristian, pagan monograph, for what he advocates is already put into practice in the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America,

in the various syncretistic, modernistic "union churches" all over the country, and in the present-day, unionistic church-union movements, championed especially by Anglicanism. If Morrison's book has any objective, it is to get rid of the last vestige of Bible veneration as the divine rule of faith and life and of the last insistence upon Christian creeds, still maintained by Fundamentalist sectarianism; for these impede the unchristian union-movement now contemplated by Modernists, which is to say, the utter paganization of Christendom under the guise of external Christian forms and formulas. Just how this Christless, Bibleless, creedless pagan "body of Christ" is to function, well, that is quite another story; for that Morrison has no recipe. Modernism only destroys, never builds up.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

**Amerikanischer Kalender** fuer deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1942.

Literarischer Redakteur: Dr. J. T. Mueller. Statistischer Redakteur: Rev. S. Michael. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis. 208 pages. Price, 15 cts.

**Lutheran Annual, 1942.** Literary Editor: Dr. J. T. Mueller. Statistical Editor: Rev. S. Michael. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis. 208 pages. Price, 15 cts.

These two publications need neither introduction nor recommendation, especially at the late date when this comes to the hand of the reader. But the remark of the editor in the *Kalender* (in an article describing the work necessary for the production of these publications) that in each succeeding year the statistical material is increased, while reading matter is reduced, sent the writer to the encyclopedia and a long discussion on the subject "Almanacs." It is a long story, reaching back to the time of the ancient Greeks. Even then the contents were fundamentally the same: A calendar of the divisions of the year, the times of various astronomical phenomena, and other useful and entertaining information, which in the time of the "prophetic" almanacs ran greatly to astrological predictions and other similar absurdities. Laws became necessary to check the circulation of such deleterious pamphlets; and for the same purpose more useful almanacs were compiled, by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge in England, by Benjamin Franklin in America, etc. Christian calendars were published for the purpose of displacing such harmful productions with something better and more beneficial; hence, the reading matter played a great part in these books. In our own almanacs this purpose is almost lost; only 24 of the 208 pages are given to educational and devotional material. The reason for this is, of course, not that we disregard the need of such material, but that there are many and better ways today for providing it. But the statistical section in our annuals has become more useful with each new edition. This time the list of institutions (universities, hospitals) served by our pastors has been greatly increased. It is noted also that the historical data following each date in the calendar are often changed, so that the owner of a collection of succeeding annuals will have quite a selection of significant dates in Lutheran Church history.—A copy of one of these booklets is, of course, an absolute necessity in every home in the Synodical Conference.

THEO. HOYER